

# **Wisconsin Program Enhancement Plan**

## **Final Progress Report for 2004 – 2006**

**Includes Quarter 8, August 2006 – October 2006**

**Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services**

**Division of Children and Family Services**

**Submitted January 2007**

**To:**

**Federal Administration for Children and Families**

# **Wisconsin Final PEP Progress Report Including Quarter 8 Activities**

## **Contents**

	Page
List of Attachments	2
Introduction	3
PEP Action Steps	4
General PEP Updates	5
PEP Implementation Team Activities	8
State Performance	10
Continuous Quality Improvement Program	13
PEP Accomplishments	18
PEP Data Update	40
Performance Chart for National Standards (Table 1)	44
Performance Chart for CFSR Items (Table 2)	48
Performance Chart for CPS Investigation Timeliness (Table 3)	53

Attachments to PEP Progress Report for Quarter 8 activities:

1. Wisconsin PEP task renegotiation plan
2. List of DCFS memos issued during PEP period
3. DCFS Information Memo 2006-17
4. DCFS Information Memo 2006-19
5. DCFS Information Memo 2006-20
6. DCFS Numbered Memo 2006-18
7. DCFS Numbered Memo 2006-19
8. Draft Memo on Trial Reunification
9. Drafting Memo on Locating Non-Custodial Parents

## **Introduction**

This progress report describes Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) implementation activities completed during the two-year PEP period of November 1, 2004 through October 31, 2006, including activities during the final 8th quarter of August 1, 2006 through October 31, 2006. The report provides a brief summary of each of the twenty (20) action steps in the PEP and highlights the activities completed in Quarter 8. The report also identifies specific benchmark tasks that are currently in progress or were deferred and will be implemented as part of the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan, the annual state plan for federal child welfare funds.

The PEP is administered by the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the state child welfare agency within the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). The PEP is being implemented with the cooperation and participation of county and tribal child welfare agencies and other stakeholders on the PEP Implementation Team.

The progress report refers to Action Steps in the PEP, as approved by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF), to respond to the findings of the 2003 federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) of Wisconsin. The Action Steps are described in the Matrix portion of the PEP.

The complete PEP Narrative and Matrix and information about the PEP process are available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP.htm>

PEP Contact Person:

John Tuohy, Planning Director  
Division of Children and Family Services  
1 W. Wilson Street, Room 550  
Madison, WI 53708-8916  
Phone 608-267-3832  
Fax 608-266-6836  
Email [mailto: tuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us](mailto:tuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us)

### Wisconsin PEP Action Steps

The following table shows how the 20 action steps in the PEP are intended to address the Safety, Permanency or Well Being Outcomes and the Systemic Factors for which Wisconsin was found in need of improvement in the federal CFSR report. The table shows the primary Outcome or System Factor addressed by the action step. Within individual action steps, the specific benchmark tasks may have impacts on other areas.

PEP Action Step	Safety 1	Safety 2	Perman- ency 1	Perman- ency 2	Well Being 1	Well Being 3	Case Review	Quality Assur.	Train- ing	Service Array
A. Access Standard, scope of CPS services	X									
B. Safety Intervention Standard		X								
C. Stabilize placements and reduce re-entry			X							
D. Placement in permanent or adoptive homes			X							
E. Sibling placement				X						
F. Family visitation and interaction				X						
G. Compliance with ICWA requirements				X						
H. Use of relatives for placement				X						
I. Involve non-custodial parents				X						
J. Family Assessment and case planning					X					
K. Support to foster parents					X					
L. Managed care program in Milwaukee						X				
M. Mental health screening						X				
N. Family involvement in case planning			X				X			
O. Termination of parental rights process							X			
P. Role of foster parents in hearings							X			
Q. Statewide quality assurance program								X		
R. Expand child welfare training									X	
S. Enhance BPP staff capacity	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
T. Capacity to meet service needs										X

## **General PEP Updates**

### Funding for PEP Initiatives

Additional resources were received by DCFS for implementation of several PEP initiatives, including the Quality Service Review (QSR) county case review process, the Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center, expansion of the child welfare training system, and policy development and technical assistance activities. The resources were initially provided from unspent funds in State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2005 and DCFS received continued state funding in the 2005–2007 biennial budget period. The Governor's 2005-2007 budget bill, 2005 Wisconsin Act 25, was signed into law on July 25, 2005 and included ongoing funding for these PEP initiatives at the SFY 2005 level.

DCFS also used some Title IV-B Subpart 2 (Promoting Safe and Stable Families) funds for PEP initiatives on a one-time basis and is continuing to use IV-B to fund a portion of the QSR process.

### National Resource Centers

The DCFS utilized the assistance of several federally-funded national resource centers to provide assistance to Wisconsin over the two-year PEP period. The following resource centers provided assistance to Wisconsin:

- National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement – PEP plan process, quality assurance, and training.
- National Resource Center for Child Protective Services – Access standards, safety standards and case management action steps.
- National Child Welfare Resource Center on Legal and Judicial Issues – Permanency action steps and collaboration with courts.
- National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning – Family engagement action steps and foster parent involvement in court hearings.
- National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology – Data issues.

### Renegotiation of PEP Matrix Tasks

During Quarter 5, Wisconsin reached agreement with the federal ACF to revise several PEP action steps, generally to defer completion of certain tasks within the action steps until after the October 31, 2006 end date of the two-year PEP period. The items were initially discussed with ACF staff in January 2006 and a draft list of “renegotiation items” were submitted for ACF staff review in March 2006 following approval of the list by the PEP Implementation Team. The final list of renegotiation items (attached) was approved in April 2006, with an update in October 2006.

The tasks removed from the PEP Matrix generally pertain to permanency and well being objectives that are not critical to achievement of national standards and improvement targets for which Wisconsin can be penalized by the federal ACF. To ensure these tasks are completed, they were included in the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan submitted to ACF in June 2006. Progress reports for these tasks will be included in the Annual Services and Progress Report component of the Child and Family Services Plan.

Task deferred to Child and Family Services Plan (with action step references):

- Update policy for Child Protective Service (CPS) case findings (A.2)
- Issue policy on trial reunification/home visits (C.1)
- Local agency use of combined foster/adoptive family assessment (D.5)
- Increase child placement limit for siblings in HFS 56 (E.3)
- Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) policy requirements (G.1)
- Issue resource guide for identification and engagement of family members (H.1)
- Safety assessments for placements with relatives (H.3)
- Locate and involve non-custodial parents (I.1)
- Revision of *CPS Ongoing Service Standards and Practice Guidelines* (J.1 and N.2)
- Foster parent training requirements (K.4)
- Implement local and private agency use of foster parent handbook (K.5)
- Milwaukee managed health care project (L.1)
- Pilot mental health screening tool and develop policy on screening (M.1)
- Issue administrative rule on reasonable efforts and permanency planning (N.1)
- Automate the QSR case review tool (Q.3.10)
- Issue administrative rule on child welfare staff training requirements (R.1)
- Committee on social work curriculum (Step R.2)

### Legislation and Rules

State legislation was pursued for two of the PEP action steps, including clarifying that placement information could be shared with relatives and codification of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) into state statute. The relative provision was adopted as part of 2005 Wisconsin Act 232. The ICWA codification legislation was drafted, but not introduced in the 2005-2006 legislative session. DCFS will pursue this item in the 2007-2008 legislative session.

Administrative rules were pursued for three of the PEP action steps, including information for foster parents (HFS 37), requirements for child welfare staff training (HFS 43), and permanency planning and reasonable efforts (HFS 44). In addition, the need for rule modifications relating to foster parent handbook and training were identified for HFS 38, 54 and 56.

The information for foster parents form was modified to provide foster parents with more in-depth information about children. The form is an appendix to HFS 37 and the revised

form must go through the rules process. The rule update has been prepared and will be submitted for legislative approval in 2007.

The new HFS 43 included requirements for pre-service and ongoing training for child welfare staff. The rule was drafted in collaboration with the Child Welfare Training Council in Spring 2006. Public hearings were conducted in July 2006 and the rule was submitted for Legislative Counsel review in August 2006. DCFS has prepared a final version of the rule and will pursue legislative approval in 2007.

The initial development of the HFS 44 rule on reasonable efforts and permanency planning took place prior to the PEP. During the PEP period, DCFS established a workgroup to update the draft rule to reflect recent federal and state legislation and to emphasize those issues not addressed under state law. The draft rule is currently being reviewed by DHFS legal counsel. Following that review, DCFS will prepare a final version of the rule and pursue legislative approval in 2007, with implementation of the rule planned for 2008.

Modifications are necessary to HFS 38 and 54 to incorporate use of foster parent handbooks into the rules for private child placing agencies. Modifications were recommended by the Out-of-Home Care Committee to the current limit in HFS 56 on children that can be placed in a foster home to allow large groups of siblings to be placed together. In addition, changes will be needed to HFS 56 to define statewide requirements for foster parent training. A committee of the Child Welfare Training Council is currently developing recommendations for pre-service and ongoing training. The changes to HFS 38, 54 and 56 will likely be pursued as a package.

### Second CFSR of Wisconsin

Wisconsin was in the third year of reviews during the first round of CFSRs nationally. DCFS anticipates that Wisconsin will be in the third year for the second round of CFSRs as well. The second round has started in FFY 2007, meaning Wisconsin will likely be reviewed in FFY 2009. DCFS will plan according to a tentative schedule on beginning the state assessment process in Fall 2008 and having the on-site review in Spring 2009.

## **PEP Implementation Team Activities**

The PEP Implementation Team was created as a collaborative, cross-systems approach to guide planning and implementation of child welfare practice and policy in order to achieve the federal performance outcomes and enhance services to Wisconsin's children and families. The Implementation Team and related committees was comprised of over 80 individuals representing multiple disciplines, including domestic abuse, schools, law enforcement, juvenile justice, state courts, health care, mental health, substance abuse, and child protective services. In addition, the Implementation Team included representation from foster and adoptive parents, tribes, advocacy groups and state legislators.

The PEP Implementation Team was formed in August 2004 and met on a quarterly basis throughout the two-year PEP period, with the last meeting occurring on August 31, 2006. PEP Implementation Team meetings were broadcast on the Internet to allow remote participation. Information about the Implementation Team is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP-Team/pepTeam.htm>

### **PEP Implementation Team Structure**

The PEP Implementation Team utilized five PEP committees to help shape the policies, procedures, and practices needed to complete the PEP Action Steps. The Executive Committee met quarterly to set agendas for full Implementation Team meetings. The other PEP committees hold monthly or bi-monthly meetings. The PEP committees and their respective responsibilities are as follows:

- **PEP Executive Committee**  
The Executive Committee of the full PEP Implementation Team met between the PEP Implementation Team meetings to assist DCFS in creating long-term goals and strategies for the PEP Implementation Team, including the development of the agendas for the quarterly meetings.
- **Child Welfare Case Process**  
The Child Welfare Case Process Committee clarifies and develops policies and guidelines for standards of practice related to Access/Intake, Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services. In addition, this Committee addresses issues related to domestic violence and other child welfare associated programs and service systems.
- **Out-of-Home Care**  
The Out-of-Home Care Committee enhances policies, practices, and procedures related to Out-of-Home Placement, Title IV-E, Permanency Planning, Independent Living, Kinship Care, and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC).

- **Adoption Services**  
The Adoption Services Committee develops and updates policies, practices, and procedures related to Concurrent Permanency Planning, Termination of Parental Rights (TPR), Adoption, Adoption Search, and Adoption Assistance payments.
- **Continuous Quality Improvement**  
The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Committee designs and implements a county review process including an on-site review process and identifies the management and program information needs of counties and tribes for child welfare data reports.

In addition, for issues that involve tribal child welfare or child welfare staff and provider training, the existing Indian Child Welfare Coordination Group and State Training Council were consulted by the PEP Implementation Team for expertise and guidance. Training updates are provided at PEP Implementation Team meetings.

To facilitate public input on policies and procedures related to PEP action steps, DCFS created the PEP Bulletin Board for materials developed by PEP committees to be available for public comment. The availability of the Bulletin Board has been publicized to counties, tribes and other key stakeholders. The Bulletin Board can be accessed at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/bulletinBrd.htm>

#### Future of PEP Implementation Team

At the last PEP Implementation Team meeting in August 2006, the group recommended that the full, large group be replaced with a smaller committee to provide an ongoing forum for cross-program coordination and stakeholder participation. The DCFS is proceeding to establish the Wisconsin Child Welfare Committee (WCWC) that will include approximately 25 members from counties, tribes, the court system, and other stakeholders. The new advisory committee will provide guidance to DCFS on completion of PEP action steps moved to the Child and Family Services Plan, the second CFSR of Wisconsin, and other actions to improve the Wisconsin child welfare program.

Three of the existing PEP committee will continue as workgroups under the WCWC, including the Case Process, Out-of-Home Care and Quality Improvement committees. The Adoption Services Committee will become a workgroup of the Out-of-Home Care Committee. The committee chairs will become members of the new WCWC.

The Case Process and Out-of-Home Care Committees continue to meet on a monthly basis. The Continuous Quality Improvement Committee will begin meeting again in January 2007 and the meeting schedule will be determined at that point.

## State Performance

### National Standards

Wisconsin was required to meet improvement targets for one of the national safety standards (recurrence of maltreatment) and three of the national permanency standards (re-entry to out-of-home care, timeliness of reunification, and timeliness of adoption). The data is shown in Table 1 in the PEP Data Update section of this report (page 44). For the recurrence of maltreatment, timeliness of reunification, and timeliness of adoption standards, Wisconsin met the improvement targets.

For the permanency standard on re-entry to out-of-home care, the most recent 2006 data shows Wisconsin exceeding the improvement target. The continued high rate of re-entry is attributable in large part to two factors: 1) incorrect entry of placement changes into eWiSACWIS that appear as re-entries, and 2) how short-term stays in juvenile justice facilities are recorded in eWiSACWIS. DCFS has provided direction to counties in 2006 on how to properly record these placements, however, the changes in data entry practice are not yet reflected in the federal AFCARS data used for performance measurement. Improvements should be apparent in the AFCARS data that was submitted in November 2006. DCFS is providing additional technical assistance to counties and further improvement will be reflected in the AFCARS data that will be submitted in May 2007. DCFS will continue to monitor the re-entry data for CFSR purposes to ensure the improvement target is met.

### Case Outcomes

Wisconsin was required to meet improvement targets for 19 of the 23 CFSR outcome items. Four of the items are based on the national performance standards, one is based on state eWiSACWIS data, and 14 items are based on the results of county QSR reviews. This report includes case review data from QSR case reviews through October 2006 (see the Continuous Quality Improvement Section of the report). Table 2 in the report (page 48) shows QSR data for the 14 items using QSR case scores and information for the item using eWiSACWIS data. In addition, QSR data is shown for information purposes for the four outcomes items that Wisconsin met in the 2003 CFSR.

The case review data shows that Wisconsin is generally meeting or exceeding the case outcome improvement targets relating to safety, permanency and well-being. One item of concern regarding state performance is Item 7 - permanency goal for children. To date, the QSR data shows approximately 43% of the cases were rated a strength for this item, compared with an improvement target of 66%. Based on the experience of other states using the QSR approach, permanency scores tend to lag behind the scores in other areas and DCFS believes that there is a “case selection” effect in that counties are choosing complex placement cases for their county QSR reviews. For this item, it is important to note that permanency planning is taking place in those cases rated as needing improvement. However, more effective planning is needed to achieve timely permanency for the children. The QSR case review tool has been revised to better

capture information on permanency planning and DCFS will continue to monitor the QSR case review results to identify improvement strategies for this item. Item 7 is not one of the items subject to a federal financial penalty for not meeting the improvement target.

Another item of concern is Item 10 regarding other planned living arrangements for children in out-of-home care. To date, the QSR data shows approximately 44% of the cases were rated a strength for this item, compared with an improvement target of 72%. The number of cases for this item, 23, is low and therefore the performance level could change significantly as additional cases are reviewed. Permanency planning for these cases is often complex and the “case selection” effect could have a major impact on the scores for this item. It is important to note that these children are generally older youth who are often in out-of-home placement due to behavioral issues rather than safety issues. DCFS will examine case selection and continue to monitor the QSR case review results to identify improvement strategies for this item. Item 10 is not one of the items subject to a federal financial penalty for not meeting the improvement target.

For Item 20 on worker visits with parents, the QSR data shows state performance met the improvement target in Quarter 6 and remains very close to the improvement target for Quarters 7 and 8. At the end of Quarter 6, 77% of the cases were rated a strength for this item compared with an improvement target of 74%. Performance was not as favorable in Quarters 7 and 8 and the cumulative results show approximately 71% of the cases were rated a strength for this item. DCFS will continue to analyze the case review results for worker visits with parents to identify improvement for this item. Item 20 is one of the items subject to a federal financial penalty for not meeting the improvement target. Wisconsin met the improvement target for at least one quarter during the PEP period, and if necessary, this data item could continue to be monitored for CFSR purposes.

### **Systemic Factors**

Wisconsin was required to address four of the seven systemic factors, including Case Review, Quality Assurance, Training and Service Array. In addition, the CFSR report identified consultation with tribes as an area for improvement. Several PEP Action Steps were specifically designed to improve state compliance with federal program requirements for these factors.

Case Review – The CFSR report identified three areas needing improvement: 1) family involvement in the court process for case review, 2) the court process for termination of parental rights (TPR), and 3) foster parent participation in court hearings. Action Step N will improve family involvement in the court process through the forthcoming HFS 44 rule on reasonable efforts and permanency planning along with the family engagement provisions in the forthcoming revision of the *CPS Ongoing Service Standards*. The Director of State Courts Office (DSCO) implemented the Children’s Court Initiative (CCI) to improve court proceedings. CCI court reviews are conducted in conjunction with the QSR child welfare agency reviews conducted by DCFS. The CCI review results will be used by county circuit courts, legal staff, and the child welfare agencies to improve family involvement and reduce barriers and delays to achieving TPR for those

children with permanency goals of adoption. The foster parent handbook under Action Step K addresses the foster parent role in court hearings and permanency reviews. DCFS will issue a numbered memo specifically addressing the rights of foster parents to participate in court hearings once clarification has been received from ACF regarding the impact of recent federal legislation.

Quality Assurance – The CFSR report identified the lack of a statewide quality assurance process as an area needing improvement. In response, DCFS implemented Action Step Q establishing the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Program described in the CQI Program section of report (page 13). The QSR case reviews are part of the CQI Program.

Training – The CFSR report identified the lack of statewide pre-service training and training requirements for child welfare staff and foster parents as areas needing improvement. Under Action Step R, a statewide pre-service curriculum has been developed that focuses on essential knowledge and the foundation curriculum is being revised to focus on essential skills. The forthcoming HFS 43 rule will establish training requirements for child welfare staff. Under Action Step K, statewide pre-service and foundation curriculums for foster parents are being developed. Training requirements for foster parents will be addressed when the HFS 56 rule on foster parent licensing is revised.

Service Array – The CFSR report identified that some essential services for child safety and permanency are lacking and services are not available in all counties. Under Action Step T, DCFS conducted a comprehensive survey of services available in counties to determine where gaps in services exist and what barriers exist to client access to services. The Service Array Survey results will be used by DCFS in working with counties to develop strategies to address service gaps and resolve client barriers to access.

Tribal Consultation – Improving the Indian Child Welfare program in Wisconsin, including consultation with tribes, is addressed by Action Step G. The activities are described in the Indian Child Welfare section of the report (page 23).

## **Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Program**

This section of the report describes the CQI program, including the accomplishments under Action Step Q to establish a statewide quality assurance program and the results of the Quality Services Review (QSR) process used with counties. References are to the benchmark tasks in the PEP Matrix.

### **Q. Statewide Quality Assurance Program**

#### Q1. Select QA Vendor

The DCFS hired the CQI Program Manager Harry Hobbs in November 2004 and CQI Coordinator Tara Miller in January 2005. A competitive procurement process was conducted beginning in September 2004 to select a vendor to provide staff for the CQI county review team and consultation to DCFS in developing the CQI program. In November 2004, the CQI contract was awarded to The Management Group (TMG), an organization with experience conducting county reviews for adult long-term care programs. TMG forged a partnership with the Child Welfare Programs and Policy Group (CWP&PG) of Montgomery, AL and Human Systems and Outcomes (HSO) from Tallahassee, FL to join in the provision of consultation services to DCFS.

#### Q.2. Limited Case Reviews

Limited case reviews were conducted on 29 cases in three counties, Dane, Dodge, and Jackson during May – July 2005 conducted using the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) case review tool to collect additional information for PEP baseline performance levels. The additional 29 case scores were added to the original 50 cases from the August 2003 CFSR to establish improvement targets.

In addition, eWiSACWIS records were reviewed for 200 cases selected from Dane, Rock, Sheboygan and Winnebago counties to identify factors contributing to re-entry of children to out-of-home care and frequent placement changes or lack of placement stability. The targeted case review information was analyzed by a workgroup to identify strategies to reduce re-entry and increase placement stability.

#### Q.3. QSR Case Review Model

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Committee was formed in January 2005 to provide oversight and guidance in development of a Quality Assurance system for the county-operated child welfare programs in Wisconsin. Several sub-committees were used to develop recommendations for the case review tool and county review process.

A major task was to develop a case review protocol that would best suite Wisconsin's goal to enhance case practice. Both the federal CFSR model and the QSR model developed by HSO were field tested in May – June 2005 in Dodge and La Crosse Counties respectively to provide the CQI committee with a recommendation. The QSR model was recommended as the best method to provide counties with feedback on case practice, so the CQI Committee selected the QSR model in June 2005.

The QSR model was subsequently modified based on direction from the CQI Committee to reflect Wisconsin program standards and practice expectations. The QSR design team worked in July 2005 to “Wisconsinize” the QSR protocol and the Wisconsin QSR tool was finished in August 2005. In September 2005, the Wisconsin QSR was piloted twice, in Pierce and Washington Counties using a total of 22 cases. Upon completion of the two county pilots, the Wisconsin QSR protocol was further refined in October 2005 to enable more accurate and reliable scoring.

DCFS developed a cross-walk between the QSR case review tool and the federal CFSR case review tool to determine how the QSR scores will be used for purposes of reporting state performance on the CFSR safety, permanency and well-being outcome items. The Wisconsin QSR review tool and the CFSR cross-walk were submitted for federal approval in October 2005.

In July 2006, thirty-eight case reviewers attended an all-day meeting to begin the process of improving the QSR protocol. The redesign team examined issues regarding language and directions in the QSR tool to identify areas needing revision. The redesign team worked with HSO in August through October 2006 to revise the QSR tool. In September 2006, a meeting was held with reviewers to conduct the first inter-rater reliability study for the Wisconsin QSR process. The revised QSR tool was completed in December 2006 and will be used for reviews starting in 2007. Trainings will be held in February 2007 to instruct reviewers on the changes to the QSR tool.

One task, Q.3.10 to include the QSR case review tool in eWiSACWIS, was deleted from the PEP. The QSR tool is complex and subject to revision, so automating the tool is not feasible at this point. DCFS will continue to explore ways to assist counties to use the QSR tool for their own local quality assurance purposes.

### Children’s Court Initiative

The Children’s Court Initiative (CCI) was begun during the PEP as part of the federally-funded Court Improvement Program to review court practice for Child Protection (CHIPS) and TPR cases. Staff from the Director of State Courts Office (DSCO) review case files, conduct interviews and observe hearings to examine various aspects of court practice for CHIPS and TPR cases, including the timeliness of hearings and completeness of court findings. Upon completion of the review, a CCI report is issued to the lead judge in the county.

DCFS worked with DSCO to conduct the QSR and CCI reviews of counties at the same time. The CCI reviewers accompany the CQI team to counties and perform concurrent reviews during the same week. Some of the focus groups are conducted jointly by CQI and CCI staff to explore both child welfare case practice and legal issues and identify opportunities for improving outcomes for children and families. The QSR and CCI review leaders meet within two weeks following the review to share their respective findings, highlight significant strengths of the county, and identify opportunities for improvement.

This practice of concurrent QSR and CCI reviews enabled Wisconsin to become the first state in the nation to measure the impact that both the child welfare agency and county court have on outcomes for children and families in the child welfare system.

#### Q.3.8 QSR Review Schedule

The QSR process begins with orientation meetings with the county starting six months in advance of the on-site review to explain the QSR process and identify specific issues to explore during the review. A member of the CQI team is designated as the lead for the review and works with the county to select cases and schedule interviews with individual stakeholders and focus groups. Staff from the DCFS research section meet with the county to review data reports on caseload activity outcome measures, which may influence case selection and the issues explored during focus groups. The cases reviewed include both in-home services and out-of-placements. The CQI lead is responsible for managing the on-site review, conducting the summary meeting with the host county, and preparing the QSR report which is issued within 90 days following the review.

After completion of the on-site review, the CQI lead reviewer assists the county to develop a local program improvement plan. Beginning in 2007, DCFS will make technical assistance resources available to counties to facilitate development and implementation of local program improvement plans and provide consultation on specific aspects of case practice.

The QSR review schedule began in October 2005. DCFS intends to review 15 counties and the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW) annually. The following counties were reviewed during the PEP period:

Rock, 12 cases, October 2005  
Waukesha, 12 cases, November 2005  
Iowa, 10 cases, January 2006  
St. Croix, 10 cases, February 2006  
Dane, 24 cases, March 2006  
Sheboygan, 12 cases, April 2006  
Washburn and Burnett, 12 cases (6 in each county), May 2006  
Adams, 8 cases, June 2006  
Waupaca, 12 cases, June 2006  
Green, 12 cases, July 2006  
Barron, 12 cases, August 2006  
Marquette, 8 cases, September 2006  
Columbia, 10 cases, October 2006  
Milwaukee, 23 cases, October 2006

As described previously, the CQI team also completed three limited case reviews using the CFSR protocol and three pilot reviews of the QSR.

During Quarter 8 of the PEP, the CQI team completed child welfare reviews in four counties as follows:

- Barron (8/21 – 8/25) A review team of 14 persons reviewed 12 cases and interviewed 111 persons. Twelve focus groups were held with 132 participants.
- Marquette (9/11 – 9/15) A review team of 11 persons reviewed 8 cases and interviewed 74 persons. Eleven focus groups were held with 40 participants.
- Columbia (10/2 – 10/6) A review team of 13 persons reviewed 10 cases and interviewed 87 persons. Fourteen focus groups were held with 49 participants.
- Milwaukee (10/16 – 10/27) A review team of 32 persons (including 8 Shadow 1 observers) reviewed 24 cases and interviewed 200 persons. Thirty-one focus groups were held with 132 participants

#### Q.4 Integrate BMCW QA Process

The BMCW had a comprehensive case review process in place prior to the PEP to assure the quality of child welfare services. In June 2006, BMCW in conjunction with community members of the Milwaukee QA Steering Committee, made the decision to use the QSR process beginning with case reviews of the Ongoing Case Management (placement cases) program and Safety Service (in-home cases) program. The Milwaukee QSR review was held October 16-27, 2006, with 15 Ongoing cases and 9 Safety Services cases reviewed. One case was not completed due to the unavailability of the family.

The CQI manager Harry Hobbs and Paul Vincent of CWP&PG served as co-site leaders for the two-week review. The review team had over 20 certified case reviewers, including five from Iowa. Eight cases from each of the three BMCW regions were randomly selected and stratified by age and gender, with no case manager having more than one case in the review. In August 2006, CQI and CCI staff conducted meetings with a total of over 400 BMCW staff and service providers from Milwaukee. The review included 31 focus groups, with some of the focus groups repeated at each of the three regions.

Approximately 80 persons were present for the summary presentation on October 27, 2006. The Milwaukee QSR results were presented to the Executive Committee of the Milwaukee Partnership Council on November 17, 2006. Other presentations were made for BMCW staff and the CEOs of the Ongoing and Safety Services agencies. Paul Vincent of CWP&PG is writing the final report and the results will be shared with the Milwaukee Partnership Council in January 2007. The results will also be shared with the community at the annual presentation on performance for the Milwaukee settlement agreement in March 2007.

The BMCW will develop and implement a quality improvement plan to address issues identified in the QSR and CCI reviews and the recommendations in the review reports to improve case practice.

#### Q.5. Develop QA Reviewers

DCFS has developed a Wisconsin peer reviewer system for the QSR process. The process includes two days of training on the QSR tool and review protocol, participating in a QSR review as an observer or “shadow,” and then participating in a QSR review as a reviewer under the direction of an experienced reviewer. After completion of the training and participating in two reviews, individuals can participate as a lead reviewer on a case and become a certified reviewer.

The members of the CQI team were the first persons from Wisconsin certified as reviewers. Initially, certified QSR reviewers from other states, particularly Iowa, were used as lead reviewers on cases while more persons from Wisconsin became certified. Since the QSR county review process began in Quarter 5, 74 persons have completed the two-day training and 26 have been certified as reviewers. Three of the CQI specialists have been certified as Site Leaders along with the CQI manager.

In addition to QSR case reviewer training, Paul Vincent trained an additional 16 certified case reviewers on how to coach and mentor newly trained QSR case reviewers. To date, twenty-five persons have completed the mentor training.

## **PEP Accomplishments**

This section of the report describes accomplishments on most of the 20 Action Steps included in the PEP. The accomplishments for Action Step Q regarding quality assurance were described in the preceding section. References are to the benchmark tasks in the PEP Matrix. Where applicable, it is noted if tasks were deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan or deleted in the renegotiation of PEP tasks.

### **A. Access to CPS Services**

A.1 Access Standard - The *Access Standard* was issued via DCFS Numbered Memo 2005-14 in November 2005 and took effect in March 2006 along with the associated modifications to eWiSACWIS. The Standard provides more clarity and direction to CPS staff around gathering and documenting information collected when a report of alleged child maltreatment is received, making the screening decision whether the report should be investigated, and assigning the investigation response time. The eWiSACWIS modification uses one document to gather information at the first point of contact with supervisor ability to subsequently assign the type of report (e.g. CPS assessment or request for voluntary services). Regional roundtables were conducted to provide training to county staff and DCFS continues to provide technical assistance.

The Wisconsin Child Welfare Training System offered training on the *Access Standard* statewide throughout 2006. The Access Standard training content will be incorporated into the pre-service and foundation training.

A.2 Case Finding Memo – The task to issue a DCFS memo providing new direction for making CPS case findings was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The case finding policy, related to making substantiation findings for abuse and neglect reports, will be included in the comprehensive revision of the *CPS Investigation Standards*, which were originally issued in 1994. The revised Standards will be issued by April 2007 with an effective date of July 2007.

### **B. Safety Assessment and Planning**

B.1 Safety Intervention Standards - The *Safety Intervention Standards* were issued via DCFS Numbered Memo 2006-09 in May 2006 and took effect in July 2006 along with the associated modifications to eWiSACWIS. The Standards provide direction for completion of Safety Assessments and how the safety of children should be evaluated over the life of the case. Regional roundtables were conducted to provide training to county staff and DCFS continues to provide technical assistance.

The *Safety Intervention Standards* training content have been incorporated into Wisconsin's web-based pre-service training. Additionally, DCFS collaborated with the Wisconsin Child Welfare Training Partnership to revise the current Foundation training for workers and supervisors to include the practice requirements of the Standards.

## **C. Stabilize Placements and Reduce Re-entry**

C.1.a and C.2.a Targeted Case Reviews - A team of CQI staff completed targeted case reviews of 200 cases selected from Dane, Rock, Sheboygan and Winnebago Counties. The counties were selected based on eWiSACWIS outcome reports showing high re-entry rates or frequent placement changes. An analysis was completed by the DCFS research section and shared with the participating county agencies, the Out-of-Home Care Committee, DCFS policy development staff, and other key stakeholder groups.

The key findings were presented to the Out-of-Home Care Committee in January 2006. These findings, along with subsequent action taken by DCFS, are:

- The majority of children experiencing unstable placements and re-entry were over the age of 10, with re-entry particularly pronounced for children age 15-18. DCFS efforts to improve stability and reduce re-entry will focus on older children.
- Both the stability and re-entry results were significantly impacted by the use of shelter and detention facilities as out-of-home placements. Additional guidance has been provided on how to document shelter and detention use in eWiSACWIS through the Placement Manual and regional training sessions.
- For re-entry, the majority of children were open with the local agency under a court order (most frequently juvenile justice) at the time of re-entry. This suggests that use of Trial Reunification as a placement setting will have a significant effect on the re-entry rate.
- For re-entry, the majority of children did not receive or did not have documentation indicating the receipt of post-reunification services. The effect of post-reunification services, including continued supervision of cases upon return home, will be analyzed along with the impact of the Trial Reunification policy.
- For counties with high re-entry rates, DCFS has followed up with the counties to determine causes and identify opportunities for improvement.
- For placement stability, the study showed patterns of children in multiple receiving home placements. Further analysis will be done on use of receiving homes.
- Given the significant variation in the use of case types, placement settings and discharge values, there is a need to improve data quality. DCFS will continue to provide technical assistance to counties and make system changes to improve the data entry in these areas.

C.1b Trial Reunification Policy - The Out-of-Home Care Committee was responsible for developing a Trial Reunification policy to guide the use of trial home visits as a strategy to reduce re-entry. The policy was developed during the PEP period, but issuance of the policy was deferred until January 2007 to coincide with implement of eWiSACWIS changes to support implementation of the policy. The policy will be issued by DCFS Numbered Memo (draft copy attached) in January 2007 and become effective on January 31, 2007. The policy has also been incorporated into the Foster Parent Handbook and will be incorporated into foster parent training curriculum.

DCFS staff will provide training and technical assistance via regional roundtables and webcasts during January and February 2007 for CPS caseworkers and supervisors. Additionally, DCFS staff will work with the Training Partnerships to incorporate the Trial Reunification policy into the Foundation training for workers by April 2007.

C.3 Placement Manual - The eWiSACWIS Placement Manual was originally issued in 2005 to provide direction to system users regarding appropriate use of placement settings and discharge reasons to ensure placements are recorded properly. Based on the targeted case reviews for re-entry and placement stability, the Placement Manual was updated in January 2006 to provide more direction on juvenile justice placements. The Placement Manual will be updated again in January 2007 to reflect the Trial Reunification policy. The Manual will continue to be updated periodically.

C.4 Emergency Response Plan - The Out-of-Home Care Committee recommended that information about what actions to take in case of an emergency or crisis with a specific child should be included in the *Information to Foster Parents, Part B Form* (CFS-872B), since the purpose of this existing form is to provide a foster parent with information related to the care of an individual child. The committee gathered information about local agency emergency or crisis response plans and made edits to that form.

The CFS-872B form is currently an attachment to Administrative Rule HFS 37, so the updated form will require approval through the administrative rule process before it can be issued. (See Item K.2 on page 30)

## **D. Placement in Permanent or Adoptive Homes**

D.1 Permanency Consultation (also Task O.3) - Direction was provided to county agencies on establishing concurrent permanency goals through development of the *Permanency Consultation Timeline*. The State Permanency Consultants (SPCs) work with county agencies to consult on permanency options for children when reunification is not feasible. The *Permanency Consultation Timeline* identifies key points in the permanency process for consultation with the SPCs and timeframes for pursuing adoption and other forms of permanence. The timeline was implemented in December 2005 via DCFS Information Memo 2005-12, and training was provided to the SPCs and all counties. In addition, the role of the SPCs has been enhanced by DCFS to better support concurrent planning by county agencies.

Wisconsin has 13 SPCs that work with counties statewide to help determine the most appropriate form of permanence based on the individual needs of each child. In addition, there is a Permanency Consultation contract in Milwaukee to perform a similar function for BMCW.

## D.2 and D.4 Permanency Plan Procedures and Policy

Policy Clarification – The DCFS issued Information Memo 2005-11 in December 2005 on *Current Federal and State Requirements for Permanency Plan Content and Procedures*, which contains clarification on definitions, procedures and content of initial and subsequent permanency plans, permanency plan reviews, permanency plan hearings, and transitional plans for independent living. The memo also includes a discussion of the authority to enable TPR prior to identification of an adoptive resources and application of exceptions to the reasonable efforts requirements.

Permanency Plan Review Template – The DCFS implemented a statewide permanency plan review report template in the June 2005 eWiSACWIS maintenance release. This template assures that all reviews conducted by administrative review panels include all of the appropriate determinations and recommendations to the court required by state and federal law. DCFS issued Numbered Memo 2005-12 on *eWiSACWIS Permanency Plan Review Changes and Template* in October 2005 to support the use of the template.

Training on Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning – The DCFS, in conjunction with DSCO, developed a curriculum and facilitated the delivery of training on PEP-related critical issues in child welfare and their impact on the court system, including actions that impact reasonable efforts and permanency planning. The program was presented at Judicial District Meetings to judges, directors of county human/social service agencies, and other legal staff involved in the children's court process. Presentations have been made in Judicial Districts 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. Judicial Districts 1 and 9 are scheduled in early 2007. Judges from District 3 participated in two other district meetings.

Adoption Definitions – DCFS issued Numbered Memo 2006-19 (copy attached) in December 2006 on *Adoption Assistance Program and Children Subject to the Indian Child Welfare Act*. The memo provides definitions of “difficult to place” and “at risk” children.

Note: The DCFS will also be issuing Administrative Rule HFS 44 on reasonable efforts and permanency planning. (See Item N.1 on page 34).

D.3 Permanency Plan Reviews – The Out-of-Home Care Committee created informational materials for permanency plan panel members to define the role of the panel. The booklet *A Guide For Permanency Plan Administrative Review Panel Members* was issued in December 2005 via DCFS Information Memo 2005-13. The booklet has been published and is available in hard copy through the Department of Health and Family Services publication center. In addition, the booklet is available on the internet for downloading, which allows county agencies that have additional information for their reviewers to tailor the booklet to their individual local needs.

D.5 Foster/Adoptive Assessment - In October 2006, Wisconsin implemented the *Structured Family Analysis Evaluation* (SAFE) model for the Special Needs Adoption Program (SNAP) and BMCW to do home studies of foster and adoptive parents. The SAFE home study format was developed by the Consortium for Children using a federal grant from ACF and provides a universal home study model for both foster and adoptive parents. In Wisconsin, the SAFE home study format is referred to as the Resource Family Evaluation (RFA). The RFA was added to eWiSACWIS in September 2006 and is required for foster and adoptive home studies performed by the SNAP and BMCW. County child welfare agencies can use the RFA on a voluntary basis for their foster parents. The RFA has also been made available by the Consortium for Children for use by tribal and private agency staff.

Training on the RFA was provided by the Consortium for Children in October for SNAP, BMCW and interested county and tribal staff. To date, almost 300 persons have been trained. In 2007, DCFS will offer the training to interested private agency staff and reach out to other counties and tribes that did not participate in the first round of training in an effort to encourage statewide utilization of the RFA.

## **E. Sibling Placement**

E.1 and E.2 Sibling Placement Policy and Use of Exceptional Rates - In January 2006, DCFS issued Informational Memo 2006-01 *Placement of Siblings in Out-of-Home Care and Adoption* which clarified the importance of placing siblings together in out-of-home care and provided guidance about searching for and documenting sibling placements on eWiSACWIS. The memo also explained how agencies can use the Exceptional component of the Uniform Foster Care Rate to support the placement of siblings together, provided examples of when it may be reasonable to separate siblings, and explained how the Indian Child Welfare Act applies to situations of sibling placement.

During 2006, DCFS staff traveled to regional CPS supervisor meetings across the state to do an overview of the memo and answer questions about the placement of siblings together in out-of-home care.

E.3 Revise Child Limit in HFS 56 - The Out-of-Home Care Committee recommended a language change to the foster home licensing rule, HFS 56, to allow agencies to grant exceptions to place more than 6 children in a foster home solely for the purpose of keeping siblings together. This recommended change only applies to family foster homes licensed under HFS 56 and does not apply to treatment foster homes. Due to the need for a rule change, this item was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The placement limit change will be incorporated into a revision of HFS 56 in 2007 that will include other PEP items and recent statutory changes.

## **F. Maintain Family Connections**

F.1. Family Interaction Policy - The Child Welfare Case Process Committee developed a policy on family interaction that promotes interaction with mothers, fathers, and siblings.

The policy specifies timeframes for initial visits following removal, establishing visitation plans and promoting other forms of interaction with families to keep children connected. The policy was issued in July 2005 via DCFS Numbered Memo. The policy did not become effective until January 2006 because the necessary eWiSACWIS changes needed to support the policy were not available until December 2005.

During the second half of 2005, DCFS staff provided training and technical assistance to child welfare supervisors and caseworkers. The training included a webcast session that allowed people who could not attend one of the sessions in person to view the session at a later date. DCFS staff from the Bureau of Programs and Policies (BPP) worked with the Bureau of Regulation and Licensing (BRL) to communicate with out-of-home care providers about the policy and answer any questions or concerns. The policy was incorporated into Foundation training for child welfare workers (Separation, Placement, and Reunification). The policy was also incorporated into the Foster Parent Handbook and included in the foster parent training curriculum.

The policy will be included in the revision of the *CPS Ongoing Service Standards* that will occur in 2009 (see Item N.2 on page 34). The policy was re-issued in March 2006 via DCFS Numbered Memo 2006-08 to address county agency concerns that were raised during roundtables, including documentation requirements.

F.2 - Indian Child Welfare Act Notification - To support consistent statewide implementation of ICWA notifications to tribes, DCFS, in conjunction with the Intertribal Child Welfare Committee, developed four new templates in eWiSACWIS and the accompanying policies and instructions. The templates are used by child welfare agencies to assure that Indian children are identified upon entry into the child welfare system and that tribes receive timely and appropriate notification regarding the placement of Indian children into out-of-home care, termination of parental rights, and pre-adoptive and adoptive placements. The templates were included in the December 2004 eWiSACWIS maintenance release and the notification policy was issued via DCFS Numbered Memo 2006-01 in January 2006.

Three of the templates, *Screening for Child's Status as Indian*, *Child's Biological Family History*, and *Request for Confirmation of Child's Indian Status*, are designed to support early and accurate identification of Indian children. The fourth template, *Notice of Involuntary Child Custody Proceeding Involving an Indian Child*, which includes the *Notification of Rights Under the Indian Child Welfare Act*, was developed to assure compliance with ICWA notification requirements.

## **G. Tribal Consultation and Indian Child Welfare Act**

### G.1. Tribal Consultation and Codification of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA)

Tribal Consultation - The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) adopted a policy effective March 2005 related to consultation with the 11 federally-recognized tribes in Wisconsin. DCFS and other DHFS staff met with tribal leaders and staff on

human services and health issues in 2005, and through those discussions, developed the 2006 Implementation Plan for the DHFS Tribal Consultation Policy. The first priority was the development of a curriculum to be used in training DHFS staff on issues related to Indian culture, sovereignty, relationships with the state and counties, and related topics. That curriculum has been established and the DHFS workgroup is in the process of developing a schedule for the provision of the training to DHFS staff. In the child welfare area, tribes had already identified seven priorities which DCFS has incorporated into the annual Child and Family Services Plan.

DCFS and other DHFS administrators and staff met with tribal leaders and staff in November 2005 on human services and health issues. This was the first meeting of agencies that will occur at least annually between DHFS and Tribal leadership. In addition, DHFS sponsors an annual tribal conference on health and human service issues.

DCFS staff meet on a bi-monthly basis with the child welfare directors and staff of all eleven federally-recognized tribes to continue implementing various pieces of the seven tribal priorities. These activities include establishing templates in eWiSACWIS to support ICWA notifications to tribes (See Item F.2 on page 23) DCFS has also recently established a workgroup to examine tribal child welfare funding issues.

Codification of ICWA. - Wisconsin has implemented the federal ICWA law, but the federal requirements were not incorporated into state law. DCFS included in its 2005 legislative package a proposal to incorporate ICWA into Wisconsin statutes in Ch. 48 (the Children's Code) and Ch. 938 (the Juvenile Justice Code). The ICWA codification is one of the seven tribal priorities included in the PEP and the Child and Family Service Plan, and thus has the support of the Wisconsin tribal child welfare program managers. A draft of the codification was developed by the Legislative Reference Bureau in conjunction with staff of DCFS and the Children's Court Improvement Project. The draft was not ready until February 2006 and the 2005-2006 legislative session ended before the codification proposal could be introduced as a bill.

The DCFS will pursue the ICWA codification legislation in the 2007-08 legislative session that. To finalize the draft legislation, worked during 2006 to assure the content of the proposed legislation is accurate and appropriately drafted. Beginning in May 2006, a workgroup comprised of state and tribal child welfare staff and attorneys reviewed the proposed legislation. The tribes indicated a preference for a separate section of Ch. 48 dealing with ICWA rather than an integrated approach. As a result, DCFS requested a new draft from the Legislative Reference Bureau. The workgroup has continued to discuss issues related to the codification, such as definitions for certain terms, such as "qualified expert witness" and "active efforts". In addition, DCFS has sought consultation from ACF Region V regarding the interaction between ICWA and other federal requirements so those issues can be addressed in state law.

This new draft was received in October 2006. When the tribes have achieved consensus on the changes, DCFS will establish a broader workgroup that will include county child welfare staff, supervisors, and managers and county legal staff (i.e., corporation counsels

and district attorneys) to review the revised draft. Based on feedback received, DCFS will work with the Legislative Reference Bureau to make any further necessary changes to the legislation so it is ready for introduction as a bill.

The PEP task under G.1.a.2 to issue a DCFS Numbered Memo on ICWA requirements was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The memo will be issued following enactment of the ICWA codification legislation.

Tribal Access to eWiSACWIS - DCFS staff and tribal representatives have had several discussions regarding providing eWiSACWIS access to tribal child welfare agencies. Most of the tribes have expressed interest in having read-only access for tribal child welfare staff so that they can follow ICWA cases involving their children in counties across the state. Some tribes may also be interested in utilizing the system for case management of their own cases. DCFS is doing research on how other states and the tribes in those states have dealt with a variety of issues related to system access.

Staff from the eWiSACWIS team met with the Intertribal Child Welfare Committee in November 2005 and discussed technical aspects of eWiSACWIS access. DCFS will begin providing read-only access to tribal child welfare staff once access agreements have been approved. eWiSACWIS staff will provide training for tribal staff on an individual basis over several months in 2007. Tribal child welfare staff will begin to discuss with tribal leadership the possibility of going beyond read-only access and using eWiSACWIS for case management purposes.

ICWA Training - A training curriculum on ICWA and delivery of services to Indian children and their families was developed by the Intertribal Child Welfare Training Partnership in collaboration with the Milwaukee Training Partnership. The curriculum was initially piloted in Milwaukee in 2005 and is being finalized for statewide use. A workgroup of state, county, and tribal representatives recently met to review a draft training curriculum, which should be approved in early 2007. The Child Welfare Training Council has directed that ICWA be included as a stand-alone course in the Foundation series of child welfare training.

G.2 Indian Child Welfare Consultant - The DCFS hired a Indian Child Welfare Consultant to work with tribal, county, state, and private agency staff regarding issues related to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), other state and federal laws, and tribal involvement in child welfare policies and programs. A primary responsibility of this position is to work with tribal, county, and state staff in implementing the seven tribal priorities included as an appendix to the PEP and the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan.

The position was filled by Ms. Loa Porter, a member of the Ho-Chunk Nation, who has been involved in child welfare for many years with the Grand Portage Tribe in Minnesota and the Ho-Chunk Nation in Wisconsin. In addition, Ms. Porter held a position similar to the Indian Child Welfare Consultant position in the State of Minnesota.

G.3 Incorporate ICWA into the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Program - DCFS monitors compliance with ICWA in two primary ways: 1) ICWA requirements have been incorporated into QSR county review protocol; and 2) as an ongoing responsibility of the DCFS Indian Child Welfare Consultant position who works with counties and tribes on program compliance and case-specific issues. DHFS Area Administrative staff are also involved in ICWA monitoring activities.

To facilitate ICWA monitoring, DCFS created an ICWA notification report in eWiSACWIS that provides data on placement cases involving Indian children. This report is used by both the Indian Child Welfare Specialist and Area Administrative staff to monitor documentation of ICWA notifications. DCFS will use other eWiSACWIS data for both in-home and out-of-home care cases. DCFS also continues to meet bi-monthly with the Indian child welfare managers of the 11 tribes to discuss issues related to ICWA that arise in the counties.

The QSR review tool incorporated select ICWA requirements into Practice Performance Indicator 9, titled Cultural Accommodations, which specifically takes cultural issues into consideration. Attention to ICWA requirements was added to other QSR performance indicators where appropriate. The CQI program manager has met with the 11 tribes to explain the QSR county review process and seek tribal child welfare staff to participate in reviews of counties with a significant tribal population. Tribal staff are included in the focus groups conducted with counties as well.

Child Welfare Agreements - The DCFS is in the process of establishing a workgroup to take a comprehensive look at funding for tribal child welfare services. This effort will include examining the cost of the out-of-home care placement of tribal children placed by either the county circuit court or the tribal court. The workgroup will also consider the content and purpose of 161 Agreements to assure that services to Indian children are being provided in an appropriate manner by the county and tribal agency. In addition, DCFS and tribal staff will also examine Title IV-E agreements between other states and the tribes located in those states.

DCFS staff, in conjunction with DHFS Tribal Affairs Office staff, have met with managers and leaders of several counties and tribes to develop local county/tribe agreements related to responsibility in the broader area of child welfare. These counties and tribes include: Sauk County and the Ho-Chunk Nation; Bayfield County and the Red Cliff Band; Burnett County and the St. Croix Band; Ashland County and the Bad River Band; and Forest County with the Potawatomi Community and the Sakoagon Tribe.

## **H. Use of Relatives for Placement**

### Identifying and Involving Relatives and Non-Custodial Parents (H.1 and I.1.1)

Resource Guide - The Out-of-Home Care Committee developed a Resource Guide that addresses identifying, locating and involving relatives and non-custodial parents to facilitate their involvement in child welfare cases. The Resource Guide was finalized in

October 2006 and the guide will be issued by DCFS through an Information Memo (draft copy attached) in January 2007. Following issuance of the guide, DCFS staff will support use of the guide by counties through presentations at regional CPS supervisor meetings.

H.2. Sharing Information with Relatives – In March 2006, Wisconsin Act 232 was signed into law which expanded the information that can be shared with relatives regarding placement of children. DCFS sought the statutory changes to allow more in-depth discussions with family members who may serve as an out-of-home placement resource. DCFS issued Information Memo 2006-17 *2005 Wisconsin Act 232: Changes to the Definition of Relatives, the Release of Information to Relatives, and Placement of Children with Relatives after Termination of Parental Rights* (copy attached) in August 2006 to explain the law change and encourage sharing of placement information with relatives.

H.3. Relative Safety Assessment - Assessing the safety of licensed and unlicensed out-of-home care providers is included in the *Safety Intervention Standards* issued in 2006. Further work on safety assessments for placements with relatives was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. Next steps are to continue to work with the National Resource Center on Child Protective Services in order to provide further guidance in this area (possibly as an appendix to the current Standards) and to make any necessary changes in eWiSACWIS by July 2007.

H.4. Relative Placement Survey - Focus groups and a survey were conducted to identify the extent of current use of relatives as placement resources and barriers to the use of relatives. The Out-of-Home Care Committee used the results to develop the Resource Guide on locating and involving relatives and non-custodial parents (see Item H.1 on page 26).

## **I. Involve Non-Custodial Parents**

I.1.1 Resource Guide – See Item H.1.

I.1.2 Non-Custodial Parent (NCP) Involvement Policy - The Out-of-Home Care Committee recommended that the Resource Guide be used as the primary method to promote the involvement of NCPs. The Committee recommended against establishing new policy directives, and recommended focusing instead on providing training and technical assistance to counties. The involvement of NCPs is considered during the QSR reviews of counties.

I.1.3 Tool in eWiSACWIS – This task was deleted based on the I.1.2 recommendation.

I.1.4 Child Support System Access - DCFS developed an agreement with the Bureau of Child Support within the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) regarding access to child support information in the KIDS system by child welfare staff, and child welfare information in eWiSACWIS by child support staff. The agreement was

presented to the Out-of-Home Care Committee and the Case Process Committee in July 2006 and shared for public comment in August 2006. The agreement was signed by the agencies in September 2006 and DCFS issued Informational Memo 2006-19 *Data Exchange and System Access Agreement between the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) and the Department of Workforce Development (DWD)* in September 2006. Joint training on the new agreement and system access was conducted by DCFS and DWD staff in November 2006.

I.1.5 Training Child Welfare Staff - DCFS will continue to provide technical assistance using the Resource Guide and address county-specific issues that arise during county QSR reviews. The Foundation series of child welfare training will be revised by mid-2007 to emphasize engagement skills, which will promote involvement of NCPs.

## **J. Family Assessment and Case Planning**

J.1.a Revise CPS Ongoing Service Standards – See Item N.2 (on page 34)

J.1.b Family Assessment and Case Plan - The DCFS worked with the Child Welfare Case Process Committee to modify the family assessment, case plan, and case progress evaluation documents in eWiSACWIS (known as the Wisconsin Model for case planning). State, county, and BMCW staff were involved in design sessions to make necessary changes to support practice requirements of the Safety Intervention Standards as well as an integrated approach to CPS intervention related to the assessment and planning process. The changes in eWiSACWIS were implemented in July 2006.

The DCFS continues to work with county, regional, and other state staff to examine ways to consolidate various case plan documents (e.g. permanency plan, case service plan) in the automated system. An Integrated Case Plan Committee has been formed to work on long-term, comprehensive changes to clarify case plan requirements, streamline workflow, and explore ways to combine or integrate timeframes for the various case plan documents.

J.2 – Service Matching - The child welfare training system has developed on-line pre-service modules that incorporate service matching with families. While the concept of service matching is integrated throughout the pre-service training as a whole; it is addressed particularly in the modules of engaging families, ongoing case management and safety. The content of these pre-service modules will be required following the promulgation of HFS 43 in 2007. Until the rule goes into effect, child welfare staff are being encouraged to use the information on a voluntary basis.

J.3. – Barriers to Engagement - The Child Welfare Case Process Committee conducted 10 regional focus groups in 2005 with child welfare workers to determine what barriers exist to engagement of families. The committee reviewed the results of the focus groups and developed actions/tasks based on the barriers identified. Actions/tasks were identified in the following categories:

- Practice

- Resources
- Cultural
- Agency
- Communication/coordination
- Mental Health & AODA
- Training

During 2006, DCFS staff worked with the Child Welfare Training Partnership to revise training courses to enhance the engagement skills of caseworkers. The Foundation series of training curriculum were revised to include methodologies for establishing and maintaining family engagement. The Training Partnerships are developing a new skills training specifically on engaging families and motivational interviewing for initial assessment and ongoing workers. The Training Partnerships are currently reviewing training modules to promote engagement skills of caseworkers developed for Utah by the Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group. These training modules will be offered on a pilot basis beginning in January 2007 and subsequently incorporated into the Foundation series of training as one of the Foundation courses.

DCFS and the Training Partnerships continue to provide training and technical assistance to child welfare supervisors on removing barriers to family engagement.

J.4. – Caseworker Contact - The Child Welfare Case Process Committee was responsible for developing and implementing a policy on face-to-face contact with parents and family members by ongoing service caseworkers. During 2005, the committee drafted the policy and sought public input. The policy was issued via DCFS Numbered Memo 2005-10 in October 2005 and became effective in January 2006.

During late 2005/early 2006, DCFS staff provided training and technical assistance to CPS supervisors through regional roundtables, who in turn provided training to the caseworkers in their agencies. DCFS also created a question and answer (Q&A) reference guide for staff. DCFS has also worked with the Child Welfare Training Partnership to update the Foundation courses related to this policy (Case Assessment and Planning).

This policy will be incorporated into the forthcoming revision of the *CPS Ongoing Services Standards* (see Item N.2 on page 34).

## **K. Support Services to Foster Parents**

K.1 Services to Foster Parents - The Out-of-Home Care Committee gathered information from foster parents and staff who work with foster care to identify the strengths and supports and services needed for foster families. The committee combined that information with additional surveys and reports from local agencies that examined foster family satisfaction. DCFS issued a report containing this combined information in June 2006 via Information Memo 2006-12 and encouraged agencies to review the information with their foster families.

In addition, the DCFS issued Numbered Memo 2006-14 in July 2006 which highlighted current statutory language that requires agencies to document the services and supports that are being provided to a child's foster family to support achievement of the permanency plan. The memo provided optional forms for agencies to use in creating support plans with their foster families.

K.2. Assessing Foster Child Needs - The Out-of-Home Care Committee spent much time reviewing and updating the existing *Information to Foster Parents, Part B Form* (CFS-872B) to arrange the information in a way that will more quickly and easily identify specific areas in which a child may need additional assessments or services. The form has been revised, but since it was originally issued as an attachment to Administrative Rule HFS 37, it must be reissued through the rule process. The rule is in the process of being revised to incorporate the new form and recent statutory changes. The rule should be ready for legislative review in 2007.

K.3 Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center – As one of the major new initiatives of Governor Jim Doyle, DCFS established a statewide resource center to serve the needs of foster and special needs adoptive parents and support county foster care recruitment. The contract for the Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center was issued in January 2005 after gathering feedback from stakeholders involved with the foster care system to determine what services they thought were necessary to support foster care and special needs adoption across the state. The contract was awarded to a consortium of three agencies including Adoption Resources of Wisconsin as the lead, PATH Wisconsin Inc., and St. Aemilian-Lakeside, Inc.

The Resource Center has three offices and four staff who provide recruitment resources, library materials, training references, and general information about foster care and adoption. The Resource Center kicked off a new statewide foster care recruitment campaign in May 2006 with First Lady Jessica Doyle and worked with AdoptUsKids to host a Recruitment Summit attended by child welfare staff from across the state in September 2006. The Resource Center was also responsible for the development of the Foster Parent Handbook under Item K.5. (see page 31)

K.4.a Pre-Service and Ongoing Training Needs of Foster Parents - The Child Welfare Training Council played the lead role for PEP action items related to foster parent training. The council formed a statewide workgroup that gathered information about the status of foster parent training statewide, including a survey of how many county agencies require training, which agencies provide training, whether both pre-service and ongoing training is provided, and the number of hours included in the training program. Based upon results of this survey, the workgroup is developing recommendations for foster parent training to be provided prior to accepting placements (Pre-service), within the first two years of a foster home licensure (Foundation), and after the first two years of licensure (Ongoing). The workgroup is committed to providing training curriculum in multiple formats that can be used by both large and small agencies.

The workgroup is currently developing the competencies and content for the Pre-service and Foundation training, which will be piloted in 2007. In addition, the workgroup is partnering with the Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center to address competencies for Ongoing training and provide increased access to Ongoing training opportunities.

K.4.b Foster Parent Training Requirements - Implementation of most tasks for this item were deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The Foster Parent Training Committee of the Training Council is currently identifying the competencies for Pre-service and Foundation foster parent training and is beginning to discuss goals and competencies for Ongoing training. Once the competencies have been approved by the Training Council, DCFS will begin the process of amending Administrative Rule 56 on foster home licensing to establish requirements for foster parent training.

The revision to HFS 56 will include increasing the sibling placement limit under Item E.3 and the foster parent handbook under Item K.5. The revisions to HFS 56 will likely be packaged with the revision to HFS 37 for Item K.2. The package of rule changes should be ready for legislative review in 2007.

Once the foster parent training requirements have been established, DCFS will reissue the Numbered Memo that outlines the requirements for Title IV-E pass-through funds to support training at the local level. The pass-through program will be revised to reflect the recommendations and training curriculum developed by the committee.

Note: In Wisconsin, approximately 85% of the special needs adoptions are by foster parents. Thus, the majority of special needs adoptive parents go through the foster parent training program and those adoptive parents who do not previously foster children go through the training as a condition of licensure.

K.5 Foster Parent Handbook - The Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center, in partnership with stakeholders involved in the foster care system including foster parents, foster care coordinators, state staff, and other participants, developed a model Foster Parent Handbook for use by county and private licensing agencies. The handbook was reviewed by the Out-of-Home Care Committee and the final product was submitted to DCFS in October 2006. Due to the timing, implementation of the handbook was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The handbook is currently being reviewed by DCFS staff and will be distributed in the spring of 2007.

In developing the handbook, the Out-of-Home Care Committee recommended not trying to address how foster parents can access community resources. That can best be done by the licensing agencies, so Benchmark Task K.5.b.2 was deleted from the PEP.

Once the handbook is available, all licensing agencies will be required to provide a handbook with specific topic areas to their foster parents. Agencies will be able to choose if they want to use the model handbook, modify an existing handbook, or create their own handbook. The model handbook is designed so that licensing agencies can customize it to meet their individual needs. Revisions will be needed to Administrative

Rules HFS 56 for counties and HFS 38 and 54 for private agencies to require use of a handbook with foster parents. DCFS will provide orientation on the model handbook and technical assistance to licensing agencies to implement the handbook requirement.

#### **L. Managed Health Care in Milwaukee**

Children in out-of-home care are known to have more complex physical, mental, and emotional health care needs than the general Medicaid population. Their caregivers report increasing difficulty in finding medical providers willing to participate in the current Medicaid fee-for-service health care delivery system. Dental and mental health services are among the difficult to access on the fee-for-service (FFS) system.

To improve the capacity to provide quality health care to children, BMCW in partnership with the Division of Health Care Financing (the State Medicaid agency) issued an RFP in October 2004 to pilot a program in Milwaukee County for the provision of Medicaid-covered services to children in foster care, court-ordered kinship care, and subsidized adoptions using a managed care organization (MCO). The MCO program was predicated on a federal Medicaid waiver to allow the children to be enrolled in the MCO. Based on preliminary approval of the waiver, the MCO provider was selected in May 2005 with implementation of the program planned for 2006. Unfortunately, federal approval of the waiver was withdrawn due to cost issues and the MCO program was ended. Thus, most of Action Step M was deleted from the PEP.

The BMCW is currently piloting a voluntary Medical Home Partnership Model for serving foster children by using a common network of medical home providers, designed to facilitate the coordinated delivery of physical, mental health and dental services to children in foster care. The process of enrolling foster children in either a HMO or FFS medical home started in November 2006 and is being phased in gradually based on the medical home provider capacity. The Medical Home program emphasizes maintaining continuity of care for children while in out-of-home care and at the time of reunification or other permanent placement. BMCW anticipates a phased-in voluntary enrollment of those children with an existing managed care relationship as well as new entries of children to out-of-home care in 2007.

#### **M. Mental Health Screening**

This PEP Action Step has two major components. 1) To develop a mental health screening tool that can be used by child welfare workers to more effectively identify children who may need mental health assessments and subsequent treatment. The screening tool will be piloted, and based on the pilot experience, the screening process will be implemented statewide. 2) To develop capacity improvement strategies to support the statewide screening, assessment and treatment of child mental health needs. The project is being done by DCFS in partnership with the Bureau of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services in the Division of Disability and Elder Services (DDES).

M.1.b Screening Tool - An internal workgroup of Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) staff was established to develop the screening tool and make recommendations to improve mental health screening for children in child welfare cases. The workgroup reviewed screening tools and recommended use of an adapted version of the California Mental Health Screening Tool (MHST) for use with children. The tool will be a basic resource to assist child welfare workers in identifying those children in need of more intensive mental health assessment and evaluation. Piloting use of the modified MHST was approved by the PEP Implementation Team in 2006.

M.1.c County Pilots - The DHFS staff workgroup recommended piloting the Wisconsin MHST in three counties to evaluate how the screening tool is used by child welfare workers and determine the impact on subsequent mental health assessment and treatment. The goal was to implement the pilots in 2006, but the pilots were deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan and will be implemented in 2007. DCFS is currently working with DDES to develop the criteria for interested counties or tribes to submit proposals to participate in the pilots. The criteria will be issued through a joint DCFS and DDES Numbered Memo in early 2007. Both DCFS and DDES will provide a small amount of funding to each of the pilot sites. DCFS is seeking assistance from child welfare agencies in California that use the MHST to provide training to the pilot counties.

DCFS and DDES are consulting with the Institute for Research on Poverty at UW-Madison to develop an evaluation plan for the pilots. It is expected that the pilots will operate for at least two years, so preliminary results on screening are expected in mid-2008. The full evaluation results including the impact on assessment and treatment will not be available until 2009.

M.1.d Capacity Improvement Plan - This task was originally designed to develop a capacity improvement plan for mental health screening, assessment, and treatment for children and families in the child welfare system. However, after the DHFS workgroup discussed the timelines and feasibility for developing a statewide capacity plan to address mental health needs of children in the child welfare system, this task was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The capacity building discussions will continue while the mental health screening pilots are being conducted.

M.1.e Mental Health Screening Policy – The task of developing a policy for statewide implementation of mental health screening procedures by child welfare agencies was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. The policy development will likely begin in 2009 so the efforts can be informed by the interim evaluation results from the pilots.

M.1.f Update Wisconsin Model - As the mental health screening policy is developed, DCFS will evaluate the need for eWiSACWIS modifications to the Wisconsin Model family assessment and case planning documents. This task was also deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan.

## **N. Family Involvement in Case Planning**

N.1 Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning Rule HFS 44 - The HFS 44 rule was already in development by DCFS, in conjunction with the Director of State Courts Office (DSCO) prior to the PEP. The rule establishes direction regarding permanency planning and reasonable efforts to achieve reunification. The HFS 44 Workgroup was re-established in January 2006 and met a total of four times to review and re-write the existing draft of HFS 44. The draft rule was also shared for public comment by county agencies and other interested parties. The draft was submitted in rule format to the DHFS Office of Legal Counsel in August 2006 for review.

Implementation of the rule was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. Once approved by the Office of Legal Counsel, public hearings will be held and the rule will be submitted for Legislative Council review. The Division anticipates submitting the rule for legislative approval in 2007 for implementation in 2008. Under Item D.2, a DCFS Numbered Memo was issued in 2005 that includes all of the components of permanency planning required by state and federal law to encourage family involvement until HFS 44 is finalized.

In developing the rule, DCFS consulted with the National Resource Center on Children and the Law (American Bar Association). The Resource Center reviewed drafts of the proposed rule and may provide consultation to DCFS and DSCO in developing training curricula on permanency planning related issues for judges, district attorneys, corporation counsels, and child welfare agency staff. The Wisconsin Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center will also be involved in providing training, including “train the trainer” sessions for state, tribal, and county staff.

N.2 CPS Ongoing Service Standards - The *CPS Ongoing Service Standards and Practice Guidelines*, which were originally issued in 2002, were referenced in three of the PEP Action Steps – tasks F.1.b, J.1 and N.2. The revisions to the Ongoing Standards were deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan and will be pursued after the *CPS Investigation Standards* and HFS 44 have been issued since the revisions to the Ongoing Standards will build on those policies. The revised Ongoing Standards will also include policies issued via Numbered Memo during the PEP period, including tasks F.1 and J.4. The complete revision to the Ongoing Standards will be complete by July 2009.

## **O. Termination of Parental Rights**

O.1 Availability of Adoptive Resource - The availability of an adoptive resource is often a major barrier in pursuing TPR for children. A document was developed by DCFS entitled "Adoption Readiness and Preparation" that aids in answering questions about adoptive resources from both the child's perspective and the skill and training required for the adoptive family. The focus is on the first placement, best placement, and last placement. The document is being used by the State Permanency Consultant staff in working with county staff on permanency options for children in out-of-home care.

O.2 Training for Permanency Reviews and Hearings - DCFS and the Director of State Courts Office (DSCO) consulted with the National Resource Center on Legal and Judicial Issues on the development of a curriculum for training judges, county agency managers and supervisors, district attorneys and corporation counsel, and other actors in the child welfare system. An initial pilot training was held in August 2005 and involved selected judges, staff of the Child Welfare Training Partnerships, and other individuals. DCFS and DSCO staff developed further training and facilitated discussions between judges and county directors regarding permanency planning and other changes arising out of the PEP. The training and discussions occurred throughout 2006 at each of the ten Judicial District meetings.

Training on the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) and permanency planning is included in ongoing training available to child welfare agencies. Much of the ASFA content has been incorporated into the Pre-service and Foundation training curriculum for child welfare workers presented by the Child Welfare Training Partnerships.

O.3 Concurrent Planning Timeline - See Item D.1. (page 20)

O.4 TPR Processing - Through the Children's Court Initiative (CCI), DCFS is working with the DSCO to analyze how Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) cases are being processed. The sample of cases examined in the county CCI reviews includes TPR cases, so DSCO will be able to identify local and statewide trends that affect the timeliness of TPR case processing. The DCFS and DSCO will work jointly to analyze trends and identify steps that can be taken to improve timeliness.

O.5 Legal Services Reimbursement - To encourage counties to participate in developing legal service agreements with the District Attorney or Corporation Counsel, DCFS issued Numbered Memo 2005-13, *Title IV-E Reimbursement for Legal Services*, in October 2005 with instructions for counties to apply to participate in the program and instructions for previously-approved counties to continue receiving funds. The program provides funding to counties to support the improvement and expansion of legal services for child welfare programs.

## **P. Role of Foster Parents in Court Proceedings**

P.1 Judicial Process for Input - The Out-of-Home Care Committee developed a draft Numbered Memo that explains a foster parent's right to receive notice of and participate in any permanency hearing or permanency plan review related to the child in their care. The memo addresses notice requirements, the opportunity to be heard at hearings and reviews, the legal status of foster parents in hearings (they are not parties to the case), and explains that information they submit to the court becomes part of the court record for all parties to review. The memo also includes a form to assist foster parents in thinking about information they may want to provide at a court hearing or permanency plan review.

The DCFS was prepared to issue the memo in 2006 until the federal *Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Child Act* was enacted in July 2006. The Act changed federal law from the “opportunity” to a “right” to be heard in hearings. This memo is currently pending issuance until DCFS receives clarification from ACF regarding the federal law change and determines if any state statutes need to be changed.

P.2 Foster Parent Role in Hearings - The model Foster Parent Handbook contains information about foster parent participation in court hearings and permanency plan reviews. In addition, this information is already contained in training for social workers and will be included as a part of pre-service training for foster parents being developed in 2007.

P.3 Foster Parent Survey/Focus Groups - The Out-of-Home Care Committee discussed conducting a survey to determine the level of foster parent participation in court hearings and permanency plan reviews and decided not to pursue a statewide survey. Focus groups are conducted with foster parents as part of the QSR and CCI county review process to examine issues regarding court involvement with foster parents. Information from these focus groups will continue to be used to identify actions that can be taken to improve foster parent participation.

## **R. Child Welfare Training**

R.1 Staff Training - The federal CFSR report found Wisconsin had a strong training delivery system, but lacked a statewide Pre-service training program for new staff and requirements for Foundation and Ongoing (in-service) training. In 2005, the Child Welfare Training Council established a workgroup committee to define competencies and content for Pre-service training. The workgroup developed a comprehensive Pre-service training program that emphasizes essential knowledge and recommended an on-line web approach as the primary delivery mechanism so that new staff could complete the training on-site in their agency. DCFS entered into a contract with the Division of Information Technology (DoIT) at UW-Madison to develop the on-line modules. The modules have been completed and will be made available for voluntary county use in 2007 until the training rule is implemented.

Based on recommendations from the Training Council, DCFS drafted Administrative Rule HFS 43 to establish minimum requirements for Pre-service, Foundation and In-service training for child protective services caseworkers and supervisors in Wisconsin. The Pre-service training may be taken in on-line training modules that are coupled with on-the-job training and supervision activities. The Foundation requirement is based on the current CORE series of training and must be completed in the first two years of employment. The In-Service requirement is linked with the continuing education requirement for social worker licensure. The HFS 43 rule went through public comment and Legislative Council in 2006. The rule will be submitted for final legislative approval in 2007.

Once the rule is issued, counties will be required via DCFS Numbered Memo to submit training plans indicating how they will implement the Pre-service training in their agencies. DCFS has developed an eWiSACWIS report that will be used to track completion of the Pre-Service, Foundation and In-Service requirements based on information in the worker record in the system.

During the PEP period, training was either enhanced or developed in the areas of Indian Child Welfare Act, safety intervention, permanency planning, family interaction and visitation, service matching, engaging families, foster home matching and coordination with the licensing agency, locating and involving biological fathers, and mental health issues for child welfare cases.

R.2 Social Work Curriculum - This task calls for collaboration with UW Schools of Social Work to match the competencies in the child welfare staff training program with the Social Work degree curriculum. To concentrate on implementation of HFS 43, this task was deferred to the Child and Family Services Plan. A workgroup will be established by the Training Council in October 2007 to begin work on this project. DCFS is currently working with the Schools to determine criteria for graduates to be given exemptions for Pre-service and Foundation training.

R.3 eWiSACWIS Training - A committee of the Training Council was formed in March 2006 to work on ways to integrate training on practice issues with the skills needed to complete work in the automated case management system. The committee had made preliminary recommendations regarding Pre-service training for new workers in November 2006 and is currently working on addressing ongoing eWiSACWIS training needs. Final recommendations from this committee will be forwarded to the Training Council in 2007. DCFS will incorporate the recommendations into eWiSACWIS training and technical assistance activities.

R.4 Training Capacity – Increasing the capacity of the child welfare training system is one of the major PEP initiatives. Capacity was increased by developing a contracted training coordinator position to serve as a liaison between DCFS and the university training partnerships in Wisconsin, as well as the addition of a statewide curriculum coordinator to more efficiently develop and revise training curricula. In addition, through the contract with DoIT, DCFS is exploring opportunities to utilize distance learning methods for child welfare training in Wisconsin.

### **S.1. Enhance DCFS Staff Capacity**

Since January 2005, the Bureau of Programs and Policies (BPP) has added seven new state positions in the effort to increase capacity to develop and implement policy and procedures and to provide technical assistance and training to county, tribal, and BMCW Staff. The state positions include:

- 2.0 Child Protective Services (CPS) Specialists
- Indian Child Welfare Specialist
- Legislative and Policy Consultant

- Child Welfare Case Practice Review Consultant
- Continuous Quality Improvement manager
- Continuous Quality Improvement Coordinator

In addition, the DCFS contracts for the following positions:

- Statewide Child Welfare Training Coordinator
- Statewide Child Welfare Curriculum Coordinator
- 5.0 Continuous Quality Improvement Specialists (increasing to 7.5 in 2007)

BPP oriented and trained these new staff throughout 2005 on statewide child welfare policies and procedures. Key BPP staff who have expertise related to child welfare were involved in this process. Additionally, BPP collaborated with the Wisconsin Training Partnerships to have these new staff attend pertinent training sessions related to Child Safety, Access and Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services.

### **T.1 Assess Capacity of Child Welfare Service System**

This PEP Action Step is designed to address the CFSR findings that essential services are not available and some services are not available in certain counties. The tasks included a Service Array Survey to determine the importance of services and the existence of service gaps and a Workload Survey to determine the capacity of child welfare agencies to deliver services. To work on the surveys, DCFS in partnership with the Wisconsin County Human Services Association (WCHSA), established a workgroup in October 2005 including representatives from small, medium and large-size counties, BMCW and Area Administration.

T.1 - Service Array Survey - The Service Array Survey was the initial focus of the workgroup. With technical assistance from the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, the workgroup developed a survey to determine the relative importance of services to safety and permanency, identify gaps in the availability of services, and identify barriers to client access to services. The survey included 83 services covering a wide range of services, including community prevention services, investigation services, in-home services, permanency services, and post-permanency services.

The survey was issued by DCFS in March 2006 via Numbered Memo 2006-04, which provided direction to counties on how to complete the Service Array Survey. DCFS staff attended regional meetings of CPS Supervisors and Human Services Directors to explain the survey and how the data will be used. Data was entered by workers via a web based survey and responses were received from 71 of 72 counties. DCFS analyzed survey results and presented findings to the PEP Implementation Team in August 2006. In addition, DCFS shared the summary information with counties at regional meetings and made the information available to all counties via the web, which included statewide and regional breakdowns of summary information from the survey. In October 2006, DCFS issued Information Memo 2006-20 to publicize the results of the Service Array Survey. DCFS can provide additional information to counties by request.

T.2 Workload Management Survey - The second project for the workgroup was to develop methods to determine the level of county agency staffing by job function and assess the workload associated with the job functions. The National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement assisted the group in evaluating several options for analyzing staffing and workload. In 2006, the workgroup agreed upon two surveys.

The first survey collected information from all counties regarding staffing by FTEs for the following areas: Intake, Assessment, Ongoing In-Home Services, Ongoing Out-of-Home Services, Foster Care Licensing, and Supervisor tasks. This survey was issued in November 2006 via DCFS Numbered Memo 2006-18 and most counties have responded to date. Once all counties have responded, DCFS will compare the FTE information submitted by individual counties with caseload counts from eWiSACWIS to analyze worker/caseload ratios. The FTE information will be used to analyze supervisor/worker ratios.

The second survey was completed by the 10 member agencies of the workgroup. This survey provided a more detailed analysis of workload, by determining the time that is spent by individual workers on individual tasks within the program areas specified in the FTE Survey. Workgroup counties obtained these estimates through discussions, focus groups or other means they determined. DCFS will analyze the results to determine average times for each task and how time to complete tasks varies by agency size.

The results of the FTE and workload surveys will be discussed with the workgroup in February 2007 to assess the information and determine next steps.

## PEP Data Update

The PEP data includes information on state performance relative to national performance standards relating to safety and permanency as well as information on the CFSR case review outcome items for which Wisconsin established improvement targets. The data comes from several sources, including eWiSACWIS reports specifically designed for PEP performance measurement, eWiSACWIS data submitted for federal AFCARS and NCANDS purposes, results from the state QSR case reviews and from the BMCW Comprehensive Review, and other data collection methods.

### 1. Status of NCANDS and AFCARS Reporting

NCANDS - The safety performance data used for the PEP is state data generated from eWiSACWIS. In 2004 when the PEP was implemented, DCFS was still developing the NCANDS Child and Agency files. The NCANDS information available at that point was from the Summary Data Component (SDC), which did not provide the child detail necessary for performance measurement. Therefore, state data reports from eWiSACWIS were initially used to develop baseline data for the 2003 CFSR and were subsequently approved by ACF for use with the PEP.

The NCANDS Child and Agency Files were first submitted in March 2006 for FFY 2005. During 2006, DCFS and the federal NCANDS contractor (Walter R. McDonald and Associates) worked on mapping and file logic corrections for several data elements to be consistent with NCANDS file requirements. The DCFS will resubmit the FFY 2005 Child and Agency files for analytical purposes and use the corrected file logic for the FFY 2006 submission in March 2007. The DCFS will continue to report safety performance using the state reports, but anticipates that the NCANDS Child File can be used for the national safety performance standards for the next Wisconsin CFSR.

The DCFS will continue to provide technical assistance to counties to improve the quality of safety data for NCANDS. Current challenges include timely approvals of CPS investigation results in eWiSACWIS and reflecting the results from appeals of substantiation findings. Workloads at the county level can result in delays in approving CPS investigation results, which affects when the results are reflected in the NCANDS file. The DCFS is currently exploring options to reflect the results of substantiation appeals in eWiSACWIS, so the NCANDS data reflects the final resolution of appeal cases. Experience working with the safety data shows appeals have a significant impact on the safety measure for maltreatment of children while in out-of-home care due to appeals by providers.

AFCARS – The permanency performance data used for the PEP is AFCARS data. The statewide rollout of the eWiSACWIS system was completed in July 2004, and data quality issues associated with the conversion of cases has impacted the permanency performance data, particularly for timeliness of adoption. Throughout the PEP period, DCFS has worked with county agencies and BMCW to address errors

and missing information to improve the quality of AFCARS and make improvements to the AFCARS file code.

To reflect the improvement in data quality, DCFS resubmitted AFCARS files for the 2004B – 2006A periods and the AFCARS file covering the period of April – September 2006 was submitted in November 2006. The updated files through the 2006A period were used in the permanency data presented in Table 1 (see page 44). Information from the 2006B file will be ready in January 2007 and will be used to present the final 2006 performance on the permanency measures for the PEP period. It is expected that the 2006B file will have an impact on lowering the re-entry rate.

Wisconsin underwent its first AFCARS review in July 2006. While the state performed well in most areas, several elements were identified as needing additional training and monitoring to address data quality and other elements were identified as needing technical corrections to the file coding or system enhancements to ensure consistency with AFCARS requirements. DCFS began making file code and system changes in advance of the final report in November 2006. The AFCARS improvement plan will be submitted in January 2007 and DCFS will continue to make file code and system changes throughout 2007 to address issues identified in the AFCARS report. DCFS will also provide training and technical assistance to address the data quality issues.

The DCFS continues to work with regional offices to support county agencies and the BMCW in use of Placement History Correction functionality. This functionality is used to correct missing data from case conversion and correct other placement data errors that affect the quality of permanency data. DCFS is currently developing a eWiSACWIS Placement Correction report that will be used in conjunction with this functionality to help agencies identify cases where errors in placement documentation may be present. This report currently is being tested by the county/state workgroup and will be put into production in January 2007.

## **2. State Performance on National Standards**

The state baselines for the PEP are based on the FFY 2003 AFCARS annual file for the permanency national standards and state CY 2003 data for the safety national standards. The minimum improvement targets were agreed to as part of federal approval of the PEP and must be achieved by the end of the two-year PEP period.

Table 1 (see page 44) includes data showing state performance on the national standards for safety and permanency. DCFS used updated FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 and preliminary CY 2006 state data for the safety items and FFY 2004 (04B/05A), FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 (05B/06A) based on AFCARS data resubmitted in October 2006 for the permanency items.

DCFS continues to use state eWiSACWIS reports designed based on the national standards to monitor progress on all outcomes. Recent enhancements related to the

outcome reports were made in the Reports Dashboard functionality to improve the capacity to monitor data quality.

### **3. Analysis of State Performance on National Standards**

#### Safety Outcomes

Recurrence of Maltreatment - The DCFS uses an eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report to monitor performance for this standard. The report indicates a maltreatment recurrence rate of 5.25% for CY 2004, 4.97% for CY 2005, and an estimated 3.57% for CY 2006 to date. Performance for this safety measure meets the PEP improvement target.

Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care – Wisconsin met this standard in the 2003 CFSR, so an improvement target is not specified and the data is provided for informational purposes. The DCFS uses an eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report to monitor performance for this item. The report indicates a rate of maltreatment in OHC of 0.57% for CY 2004, 0.62% for CY 2005 and a preliminary rate of 0.44% for CY 2006 to date. Based on the most recent 2006 data, Wisconsin continues to meet this standard.

Performance for this standard reflects the year-to-year fluctuations that occur with this sensitive measure that is based on a small number of cases. It is important to note that for each of the one-year periods above, the rates reflect the initial substantiation case findings. Some of these findings were later overturned upon appeal by the provider, so the performance would be better if the final findings were used. DCFS is currently exploring how to fully record appeal results in eWiSACWIS.

#### Permanency Outcomes

The performance for the four permanency national standards is based on the recent permanency profile for Wisconsin generated by ACF from AFCARS data using resubmitted files for FFY 2004B, FFY 2005, and FFY 2006. DCFS is continuing to work with ACF to replicate the permanency profile at the state level and compare the federal performance calculations with the results of the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Reports for the four permanency national standards.

The DCFS understands that data submitted to AFCARS for some children continues to result in data being excluded from the performance calculations, due to missing removal or discharge information. The recent resubmission of AFCARS files was intended to reduce the number of cases excluded for performance calculations.

Re-entry to Care - Wisconsin historically has a high rate of re-entry to out-of-home care (OHC) due to the large percentage of the OHC population age 15 or older. These older youth are generally served for juvenile justice or behavioral health reasons and their service plans authorize OHC placement as needed to control behavior. The repeated use of placement for behavior stabilization contributes to the high re-entry rate. The performance over the PEP period shows an increase in the re-entry rate since 2004, which is attributable to increased use of eWiSACWIS to record juvenile justice placements for the older youth population. The current performance of 23.3% of children entering OHC having re-entered within 12 months exceeds the PEP improvement target of 20.15%.

DCFS updated the eWiSACWIS placement manual in January 2006 to provide more direction on how to record placements in juvenile justice facilities to be consistent with AFCARS guidelines. The manual provides better guidance regarding when use of these facilities counts as an OHC placement. Implementation of the updated manual required some minor technical modifications to eWiSACWIS at the state level and service documentation changes at the local level. Training and technical assistance was provided on the updated manual beginning in March 2006, so the 2006B file covering the period of April – September 2006 will show improvement on this measure. In addition, DCFS is currently working with counties to clean up placement data entry errors that incorrectly show placement changes as re-entries to OHC. The results of this clean-up effort will be reflected in the 2007A AFCARS file covering October 2006 – March 2007 that will be submitted in May 2007. DCFS anticipates that the 2006B – 2007A period will demonstrate the necessary level of change to meet the improvement target for this measure.

Timely Reunification – The timeliness of reunification improved over the PEP period and Wisconsin meets the PEP improvement rate. Current performance for this measure is very strong with 76.7% of reunification occurring with 12 months of entry to OHC compared with an improvement target of 67.62%.

Timely Adoption – The timeliness of adoption improved over the PEP period and Wisconsin meets the PEP improvement rate. Current performance for this measure is strong with 26.9% of adoptions occurring with 24 months of entry to OHC compared with an improvement target of 20.7%.

The DCFS corrected inaccurate removal data for many cases in both FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 periods and resubmitted AFCARS files for these periods in October 2006. The data profiles generated from these resubmissions show improvements in performance and data quality for the Time to Adoption measure.

Placement Stability – Wisconsin met this standard in the 2003 CFSR, so an improvement target is not specified and the data is provided for informational purposes. Wisconsin continues to meet this standard, with current performance of 89.3% of children with two or less placements in the first 12 months in OHC.

**Table 1 - Wisconsin Achievement of National Performance Standards**

<b>Performance Standards</b>	<b>National Standard (Percent)</b>	<b>WI Data 2002 (Percent)</b>	<b>WI Data 2003 (Percent)</b>	<b>WI Data 2004 (Percent)</b>	<b>WI Data 2005 (Percent)</b>	<b>Preliminary WI Data 2006 (Percent)</b>	<b>Minimum Improvement Target (Percent)</b>
<b>Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment</b> Of all children who were victims of substantiated maltreatment reports, what percent were victims of another substantiated report within a 6-month period?	6.1 or less	6.04	7.13	5.25	4.97	3.57	6.23
<b>Safety Outcome 2 – Maltreatment While in Care</b> Of all children in out-of-home care, what percent experienced maltreatment by foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57 or less	0.26	0.30	0.57	0.62	0.44	Standard Met (2003 data)
<b>Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care</b> Of all children who entered out-of-home care, what percent re-entered care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home care episode?	8.6 or less	22.2	21.5	22.4	22.5	23.3	20.15
<b>Permanency Outcome 2 – Timely Reunification</b> Of all children reunified from out-of-home care, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into out-of-home care?	76.2 or more	66.5	65.2	74.1	74.5	76.7	67.62
<b>Permanency Outcome 3 – Timely Adoption</b> Of all children adopted from out-of-home care, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into care?	32.0 or more	17.5	17.8	26.0	28.1	26.9	20.7
<b>Permanency Outcome 4 – Placement Stability</b> Of all children in out-of-home care for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7 or more	92.3	92.6	89.7	88.9	89.3	Standard Met (2003 data)

**Data Sources:**

-- Safety Outcomes- 2002 - 2003 data is based on estimates derived from alternate methodology approved by the federal Children's Bureau; the 2004, 2005 and preliminary year to date 2006 figures are derived solely from the eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care Outcome reports.

-- Permanency Outcomes- 2002 - 2005 data are based on data profile figures generated by the federal Children's Bureau using the state's FFY AFCARS resubmissions from October 2006 for FFYB/04A (FFY 2004) and FFY 2005; preliminary 2006 data is based on the state's October resubmission of the FFY05B file and FFY06A file.

#### **4. State Performance on CFSR Case Outcome Items**

Table 2 (page 48) shows the state performance on 14 of the 19 CFSR performance items that Wisconsin is required to address in the PEP. For five of the 19 items, performance is measured using the statewide data for the national standard applicable to the item rather than case review data. These items are shown in Table 1 (page 44).

Case review data is used for 13 of the 14 items based on the results of county QSR reviews through October 2006, the 2005 BMCW Comprehensive Review, and the 2006 BMCW QSR review. For the item on CPS Investigation Timeliness, statewide data from eWiSACWIS is used to measure performance, as described in the next section on PEP performance reports.

Case review data is also shown for the four CFSR items that Wisconsin was found in conformance on during the August 2003 CFSR. This data is presented for information purposes only as these items are not addressed in the PEP.

##### Data Sources

The data presented in this report consists of information from 259 cases reviewed in sixteen counties, including the BMCW, during the period of September 2005 through October 2006. The 98 cases in the BMCW included 63 out-of-home placement cases and 36 in-home service cases. The 161 cases reviewed in the balance of the state included 89 out-of-home placement cases and 72 in-home service cases. The counties in the balance of state where QSR reviews took place include Washington, Rock, Waukesha, Iowa, St. Croix, Dane, Sheboygan, Burnett, Washburn, Waupaca, Adams, Green, Barron, Marquette and Columbia counties.

The data from the 161 cases in the balance of state is computed using scores from the QSR case reviews and the QSR/CFSR conversion methodology approved by the federal ACF in January 2006. The QSR review uses a six-point scale where scores of 4-6 are considered to be a “strength” and scores of 1-3 are considered to be “areas needing improvement.”

For 75 of the BMCW cases, the case scores are derived from comparable items reviewed in the 2005 BMCW Comprehensive Review. The review includes a random selection of both in-home and placement cases. The 2005 BMCW review process was comparable to the federal CFSR protocol and included a review team which examined the case record and conducted interviews with the family and key case participants such as placement providers, service providers and legal staff. The 2005 BMCW review used a three-point scoring methodology where the highest score is considered to be a “strength” and the two lowest scores are considered to be “areas needing improvement.”

For the remaining 23 BMCW cases, the CFSR scores are derived from the QSR review conducted in October 2006. This Milwaukee QSR review used the same QSR tool and six-point scale as the balance of state.

### Limitations of Data

For some of the CFSR case outcome items, particularly Item 10, the number of cases reviewed thus far continues to be small and thus the performance data is tentative at this point. As additional cases are reviewed in subsequent county reviews, the reliability of the performance data will improve. If necessary, case samples for county reviews will be stratified to provide a sufficient number of cases for these items.

For Items 11 and 14, the DCFS has determined that the QSR review criteria do not lend to a reasonable conversion of QSR information into the CFSR equivalent scores. The DCFS has completed efforts to revise the QSR on-site review tool to better track results that can be reliably converted to CFSR scores on applicable cases for these performance items. This was completed in November 2006 and the revised review tool will be used beginning with the review taking place in 2007.

### State Performance

As specified in the federal ACF approval of the PEP, Wisconsin must demonstrate a 2% improvement for the 14 items that case review or eWiSACWIS data is used. The improvement targets for the five CFSR items tied to National Standards are shown in Table 1 (page 44). For Safety Items 1 and 3 and Well Being Items 17, 18 and 20, Wisconsin must achieve the 2% improvement to avoid federal financial penalties on those items. The improvement targets for the five items tied to national standards must also be achieved to avoid financial penalties.

Safety - For all of the Safety Items 1-3, Wisconsin is meeting the PEP improvement targets. Wisconsin met Item 4 (risk of harm) in the 2003 CFSR and continues to show strong performance for this item.

Permanency – Wisconsin is meeting most of the PEP improvement targets for Items 5-10 related to permanency planning. For Items 7 (permanency goals) and 10 (other planned living arrangement), the results show Wisconsin is below the improvement targets. As noted above, the number of cases with scores for Item 10 is small. The QSR review tool has been revised to better capture performance data on the quality and timeliness of permanency planning efforts.

For Items 11-16 relating to preserving family and cultural connections, Wisconsin is meeting the improvement targets. Wisconsin met Item 11 (placement proximity) in the 2003 CSFR, but this was not measured reliably by the QSR tool so no data is shown. For Item 14 (preserving cultural connections), the QSR review tool has been revised to better capture performance data. The results for Item 16 (relationship with parents) shows a dip in the last quarter, but performance met the improvement target for most of the PEP period.

Well Being - For Items 17 and 18, the results show Wisconsin is meeting the improvement targets, with particularly strong performance for Item 17 (assessment of service needs). Based on the national CFSR results, improved performance on Item 18 (family involvement in case planning) will lead to improved outcomes for safety and permanency. Wisconsin met Item 19 (visits with child) in the 2003 CFSR and continues to show strong performance for this item. For Item 20 (visits with parents), Wisconsin met the improvement target in one quarter and has remained close to the target for the duration of the PEP period.

Wisconsin met Item 21 (educational needs) in the 2003 CFSR and continues to show good performance for this item, although the performance is lower than the CFSR score for this item. The QSR tool has a strong emphasis on education and explores educational needs more in depth than the CFSR. For Items 22 and 23 relating to physical and mental health, Wisconsin shows very strong performance and meets the improvement targets.

**Table 2 – State Performance on CFSR Outcome Items**

Item	Description	Baseline	Quarter 5 Performance	Quarter 5 and 6 Performance	Quarters 5-7 Performance	Quarters 5-8 Performance	Improvement Target
<b>Safety Outcome 1 &amp; 2 Performance Items</b>							
1 *	Timeliness of CPS investigations	44.8%	49.9%	55.7%	49.3%	46.8%	46.8%
2 *	Recurrence of maltreatment	7.13%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	6.23%
3 *	Services to prevent removal	79%	88.6%	89.8%	87.9%	86.5%	81%
4	Risk of harm to child	86%	95.5%	98.9%	99.2%	99.5%	N/A
<b>Permanency Outcome 1 Performance Items</b>							
5 *	Re-entry to out-of-home care	21.5%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	20.15%
6 *	Stability of out-of-home care placements	86.7%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	Maintain 86.7%
7	Permanency goal for child	64%	36.0%	44.9%	42.7%	42.6%	66%
8 *	Reunification, guardianship, and placement with relatives	65.2%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	67.6%
9 *	Adoption	17.8%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	20.7%
10	Other planned living arrangement	70%	40% (n = 5)	50.0% (n=10)	36.8% (n=19)	43.5% (n=23)	72%
<b>Permanency Outcome 2 Performance Items</b>							
11	Placement proximity	100%	N/A	N/A	NA	NA	N/A
12	Placement with siblings	59%	100.0%	85.7%	87.0%	82.4%	61%
13	Visiting with parents and siblings in out-of-home care	61%	65.2%	64.3%	64.6%	64.4%	63%
14	Preserving connections	68%	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA	70%
15	Relative placement	53%	84.0%	73.9%	68.1%	71.7%	55%
16	Relationship of child in care with parents	67%	70.8%	70.2%	73.2%	67.7%	69%

Well-Being Outcome 1 Performance Items							
17 *	Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents	56%	75.0%	85.2%	81.2%	82.2%	58%
18 *	Child/family involvement in case planning	56%	65.9%	67.1%	64.6%	66.9%	58%
19	Worker visits with child	88%	92.3%	89.7%	82.4%	83.6%	N/A
20 *	Worker visits with parents	72%	72.7%	77.0%	72.1%	70.7%	74%
Well Being Outcomes 2 and 3 Performance Items							
21	Educational needs of child	91%	82.7%	81.8%	84.1%	81.6%	N/A
22	Physical health of child	87%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.5%	89%
23	Mental health of child	71%	82.2%	90.9%	90.2%	91.4%	73%

#### Explanation of Outcome Performance Table:


\*

Performance Target met at least one Quarter during PEP Period

Performance Target not met or evaluated during at least one Quarter during PEP Period

Item measured using National Standard or not applicable for PEP

Item subject to federal penalties if fail to meet Performance Target

## 5. eWiSACWIS Performance Reports

The performance reports used for the PEP include a set of Federal Outcome Reports that replicate the national standards for safety and permanency using data directly from eWiSACWIS. The DCFS also uses PEP Performance Reports to measure the impact of PEP Action Steps for several safety, permanency and well being outcome items.

eWiSACWIS Reports – The DCFS continues to work with the BMCW, county agencies and the regional offices to refine the reports used to provide information for the PEP and to support local and state analysis of case activity. The DCFS has provided ongoing consultation and technical assistance to the regional offices and local agency staff regarding use of these reports and continues to include local agency staff in the report design and testing processes.

The PEP Reports address the following performance measures as either a primary or secondary data source as follows:

<b>PEP Performance Measure</b>	<b>PEP Report Name</b>	<b>Primary Performance Data Source</b>	<b>Secondary Performance Data Source</b>
<b>Safety</b>			
Timeliness of CPS Initial Assessments	CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness	PEP Report	N/A
Safety Assessments, Plans and Services	CPS Safety	Case Review Results	PEP Report
<b>Permanency</b>			
Timeliness of ASFA Documentation	ASFA Documentation	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Completeness of ICWA Notification	ICWA Notification	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Sibling Placement	Siblings in Placement	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency Planning	Permanency Planning Detail	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Independent Living Assessment and Planning	Independent Living	Case Review Results	PEP Report
<b>Well Being</b>			
Timeliness of Family Assessments & Case Planning	Family Assessments and Case Plans	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Monthly Contacts for Ongoing Cases	Contacts with Children and Parents	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Education Screen for Ongoing Cases	Education Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Medical/MH Screen for Ongoing Cases	Medical Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report

## 6. Report Development

The DCFS has continued to work with the regional offices, county agencies, the BMCW and the state Special Needs Adoption Program to identify and address training and technical assistance to support the accuracy and timeliness of critical documentation in eWiSACWIS related to data used in the above-mentioned PEP reports.

DCFS continues efforts to improve the quality and accuracy of documentation in eWiSACWIS related to the PEP and Outcome reports. The following enhancements were made to eWiSACWIS reports and report functionality in the September 2006 release:

- Enhancements to the Case List report to enable workers and supervisors to obtain a listing of open cases and case activity by worker;
- Enhancements to the Placement Stability report to add provider data to the child detail output;

- Modifications to the ICWA report to denote whether an Indian child is subject to ICWA in the Child Detail output and to provide Summary data only for those children who are subject to ICWA; and
- Enhancements to the CPS Access (Intake) Report to include the new “Manufacturing Methamphetamine” as a maltreatment allegation type, to incorporate additional child data in the Child Detail output to expand the usefulness of this report, and to add a Report Key to the Summary output.

In addition to the above enhancements, the DCFS has begun work on creating or enhancing the following reports for the January 2007 release:

- Development of a worker training completion report to provide information on completion of pre-service and foundation training by workers as specified in the forthcoming HFS 43 Administrative Rule.
- Development of a Placement Correction report to be used in conjunction with the Placement History Correction functionality. The report identifies children where there are or may be placement documentation errors for children in placement during a specified period. Placement errors include children who have missing removal or discharge dates and children who have gaps in placement.
- Enhancements to the Kinship Care Report to include additional placement and payment information for children in voluntary and court-ordered kinship care.
- Enhancements to the Time to Adoption report to provide separate information on 1) time from removal from home to TPR and 2) from TPR to finalization of adoption. The revision will allow the TPR part of the report to be used more effectively by counties while the finalization part applies to the state adoption program.

In October 2006, the DCFS tested the use of business intelligence software to determine the feasibility of developing a child welfare data mart for eWiSACWIS reporting purposes. Beginning in 2007, the DCFS will proceed with the development of a data mart and use of business intelligence software to allow for more flexibility in analyzing child welfare data and the capacity to drill down from summary information to case detail.

## **7. CPS Timeliness Report**

This report is used as the primary data source for CFSR Safety Item 1 relating to timeliness of CPS investigations. The report uses eWiSACWIS data on completed CPS Initial Assessments, including the date the CPS report was received by the agency, the assigned response time, and when the initial face-to-face contact with the children involved in the CPS report was attempted or occurred. Timeliness is measured based on the percentage of valid CPS reports where the face-to-face contact occurred within the assigned response time. Response times can vary from within the same working day for high priority CPS reports to 2-5 days for low priority CPS reports.

Table 3 shows data for the baseline period of Quarter 4 of CY 2004 and Quarter 1 of CY 2005 and performance data from Quarters 2 of CY 2005 through Quarter 3 of CY 2006. The baseline performance level of 44.8% was approved by the federal ACF in January 2006. While the state has generally made steady progress in its performance and data quality, the most recent 2006 Quarter 3 data shows a very small decline in timely performance and data quality. Despite the decline, Wisconsin continues to meet the PEP improvement target.

The DCFS will continue efforts to better utilize eWiSACWIS data quality reports for CPS investigations and provide training and technical assistance to counties and BMCW. These efforts will result in continued improvements in performance and data quality related to the timeliness of CPS investigations.

**Table 3 - CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness**

**BASELINE RESULTS**

***CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2004, Quarter 4***

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>0-2 Hrs</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>2-5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	265	1,169	1,092	4,293	125	6,944
Total Records Valid *	127	504	749	2,666	NA	4,046
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>47.9%</i>	<i>43.1%</i>	<i>68.6%</i>	<i>62.1%</i>	NA	<i>58.3%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	50	213	203	1,273	NA	1,739
Sub-Total outside Response Time	77	291	546	1,393	NA	2,307
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b><i>39.4%</i></b>	<b><i>42.3%</i></b>	<b><i>27.1%</i></b>	<b><i>47.7%</i></b>	<b>NA</b>	<b><i>43.0%</i></b>

***CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Quarter 1***

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>0-2 Hrs</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>2-5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	269	1,254	1,265	4,688	152	7,628
Total Records Valid *	138	589	847	3,048	NA	4,622
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>51.3%</i>	<i>47.0%</i>	<i>67.0%</i>	<i>65.0%</i>	NA	<i>60.6%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	267	290	1,494	NA	2,147
Sub-Total outside Response Time	42	322	557	1,554	NA	2,475
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b><i>69.6%</i></b>	<b><i>45.3%</i></b>	<b><i>34.2%</i></b>	<b><i>49.0%</i></b>	<b>NA</b>	<b><i>46.5%</i></b>

<b><i>Baseline Performance for PEP (average of two baseline quarters)</i></b>	<b><i>44.8%</i></b>
---	---------------------

### PERFORMANCE PERIOD RESULTS

#### *CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Quarter 2*

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>0-2 Hrs</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>2-5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	291	1,914	1,347	4,896	67	8,515
Total Records Valid *	151	638	911	3,148	NA	4,848
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	51.9%	33.3%	67.6%	64.3%	NA	56.9%
Sub-Total within Response Time	106	325	335	1,538	NA	2,304
Sub-Total outside Response Time	45	313	576	1,610	NA	2,544
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>36.8%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>47.5%</b>

#### *CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Quarter 3*

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>0-2 Hrs</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>2-5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	245	1,183	1,212	4,415	115	7,170
Total Records Valid *	129	569	819	2,882	NA	4,399
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	52.7%	48.1%	67.6%	65.3%	NA	61.4%
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	239	277	1,469	NA	2,081
Sub-Total outside Response Time	33	330	542	1,413	NA	2,318
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b>74.4%</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>47.3%</b>

#### *CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Quarter 4*

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>0-2 Hrs</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>2-5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	235	1,082	1,106	4,087	63	6,573
Total Records Valid *	119	481	735	2,657	NA	3,992
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	50.6%	44.5%	66.5%	65.0%	NA	60.7%
Sub-Total within Response Time	89	228	283	1,326	NA	1,926
Sub-Total outside Response Time	30	253	452	1,331	NA	2,066
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b>74.8%</b>	<b>47.4%</b>	<b>38.5%</b>	<b>49.9%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>48.2%</b>

***CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2006, Quarter 1***

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>48 Hours</b>	<b>W/in 5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	285	1,233	1,200	4,727	63	7,508
Total Records Valid *	136	540	823	3,220	NA	4,719
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>47.7%</i>	<i>43.8%</i>	<i>68.6%</i>	<i>68.1%</i>	NA	<i>62.9%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	100	332	576	1,620	NA	2,628
Sub-Total outside Response Time	36	208	247	1,600	NA	2,091
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b><i>73.5%</i></b>	<b><i>61.5%</i></b>	<b><i>70.0%</i></b>	<b><i>50.3%</i></b>	<b><i>NA</i></b>	<b><i>55.7%</i></b>

***CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2006, Quarter 2***

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>48 Hours</b>	<b>W/in 5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	842	1,115	924	4,781	57	7,719
Total Records Valid *	394	602	656	3,149	NA	4,801
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>46.8%</i>	<i>54.0%</i>	<i>71.0%</i>	<i>65.9%</i>	NA	<i>62.2%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	205	267	411	1,486	NA	2,369
Sub-Total outside Response Time	189	335	245	1,663	NA	2,432
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b><i>52.0%</i></b>	<b><i>44.4%</i></b>	<b><i>62.7%</i></b>	<b><i>47.2%</i></b>	<b><i>NA</i></b>	<b><i>49.3%</i></b>

***CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2006, Quarter 3***

<b>Statewide Results</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>24 Hrs</b>	<b>48 Hours</b>	<b>W/in 5 Days</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Total Records	1125	1068	934	4568	57	7,752
Total Records Valid *	540	611	618	2,987	NA	4,756
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>48.0%</i>	<i>57.2%</i>	<i>66.2%</i>	<i>65.4%</i>	NA	<i>61.4%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	317	226	322	1,362	NA	2,227
Sub-Total outside Response Time	223	385	296	1,625	NA	2,529
<b><i>Percentage within Response Time</i></b>	<b><i>58.7%</i></b>	<b><i>37.0%</i></b>	<b><i>52.1%</i></b>	<b><i>45.6%</i></b>	<b><i>NA</i></b>	<b><i>46.8%</i></b>

\* Valid records include those records where contact information is documented as required, is not a negative ('-') number, and is not greater than 99 days.

